HN
37
.C3
F86
1945

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
OCT 15 1945
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

HN 37 .C3 F86 1945
Furfey, Paul Hanly, 1896-
The mystery of iniquity

THE
MYSTERY OF INIQUITY

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
OCT 15 1945
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Mystery of Iniquity

By

PAUL HANLY FURFEY

Professor and Head of the Department of Sociology
The Catholic University of America

THE BRUCE PUBLISHING COMPANY
MILWAUKEE

Nihil obstat: Louis A. Arand, S.S., S.T.D., Censor Deputatus
Imprimatur: ✠ Michael J. Curley, D.D., Archiepiscopus
Baltimorensis-Washingtonensis
January 8, 1944

(Second Printing — 1945)

This book is reprinted in full accord with the regulations of the War Production Board for the conservation of paper, metals, and other essential materials.

Copyright, 1944
The Bruce Publishing Company
Printed in the United States of America

To the memory of my mother

MARGARET HANLY FURFEY

a valiant woman

PREFACE

TODAY, in the midst of the most terrible of wars, no thinking person can fail to reflect on the problem of evil in society. Social scientists and publicists have devoted earnest efforts to the consideration of the nature of this problem and its possible solutions. We Catholics are in a uniquely advantageous position for discussing this issue intelligently because we have at our disposal not only the data of social science but the truths of revelation as well. The present seems an appropriate time for reviewing the Catholic position on social evil in its contemporary aspects. This is my excuse for offering the present book to the public.

The importance of the subject has demanded an extremely frank treatment. I hope that my desire to state the truth sincerely as I see it has not led me into unfairness. If I have unintentionally wounded anyone by erroneous judgment, I can only ask pardon in advance and hope that friendly critics will correct me.

Quotations from papal documents are given in the official English translations issued by the Vatican where these are available. Where they are not, I have in every case made my own translations from the original, since experience has shown that existing versions cannot always be trusted. I have, however, been aided in my own translation by the use of these versions wherever they were faithful to the original. Quotations from the New Testament follow the Confraternity Version and those from the Old Testament, the Douay Version, except that I have occasionally revised the latter to bring them into better conformity with the Hebrew, as stated in the notes.

Friends too numerous to mention by name have aided me immeasurably in the writing of this book. While most of them must remain anonymous, I cannot forbear to mention the names of two. Dr. Louis A. Arand of the School of Theology of the Catholic University of America not only performed efficiently his office of ecclesiastical censor but aided me in various other ways by his expert knowledge of dogmatic theology. Dr. Mary Elizabeth Walsh, my colleague in the Department of Sociology, discussed the book with me many times while it was being written and helped me with many relevant suggestions. To these and to all who have aided me in any way I extend my warmest thanks.

PAUL HANLY FURFEY

Feast of St. John the Evangelist, 1943.

CONTENTS

Chapter	*Page*
1. Satan and Social Problems	13
2. Catholic Conformism	30
3. The Excuses of the Conformists	42
4. Christ Was No Conformist	55
5. Conformist Sociology	68
6. The Mammon of Wickedness	84
7. Conformist Social Work	102
8. Conformism and the Labor Problem	115
9. Satan Invades the Home	126
10. Conformism and Race	138
11. Exaggerated Nationalism	152
12. "Come Out From Among Them, Be Separated"	168
Footnotes	180
Index	191

THE
MYSTERY OF INIQUITY

Chapter 1

SATAN AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

CATHOLICS have their own distinctive doctrine about the ills which plague society, their causes and their remedies. Unbelieving social scientists and the modern world in general have a doctrine of their own. The two viewpoints are completely and utterly different — not by any stretch of the imagination can they possibly be reconciled. This point is of supreme importance. Unless it is thoroughly understood, straight thinking on the problems of society is impossible.

To grasp this fundamental point it is enough to examine the authoritative statements of the two groups. The attitude of the modern non-Catholic world is expressed everywhere, but it is expressed most formally and systematically by the unbelieving social scientists. They begin with the frank rejection of ethics. "Sociology," says Reuter, "is the ethically neutral study of group life and human behavior."[1] Since sociology includes the study of social problems, this may appear a bit surprising. It might seem a little difficult even to define a social problem without some sort of an ethical norm. The sociologists, however, have risen to the occasion and have thought out a number of definitions without benefit of ethics.

One proposed solution is to consider social problems as deviations from group standards, the *mores* as they are called. To Phelps social problems are "hindrances and obstructions to human values. They are handicaps to the achievement of that which a society chooses to call 'normal

social life.' "[2] To Bossard they are situations "constituting a threat to social well-being . . . as defined by the mores of the group."[3] Reduced to its simplest terms, this is a rather childish formula. If one applies it consistently, then one must admit that any abuse sanctioned by current opinion is excluded from the category of social problems. If most people approve easy divorce and lax sex morals, then these evils are no evils at all. Race discrimination is no problem when the mores sanction the persecution of the Negro. Conversely, if a saint insists on breaking with the current mores and living a life of heroic virtue, he becomes by that fact a social problem. Bizarre as this conclusion seems, Gillin does not shrink from it. He discusses "St. Louis of Gonzaga, Margaret Mary Alacoque, both of feeble intellect," in a paragraph headed *The Degenerate and Religion.*[4] To such absurdities is "ethically neutral" sociology reduced as logic goes by the board!

Other writers, dominated by the evolutionary viewpoint, think of social problems in terms of social change. "Our social problems," writes Mangold, "constitute phases of cultural evolution."[5] Gillin, Dittmer, and Colbert see the origin of such problems in "the difficulty confronting such a large part of the population in its efforts to keep pace with the demands of the times."[6] This, too, is a shallow analysis. It is of course true that social changes create maladjustments; but the essence of a social problem is not simply a matter of being out of date. Sometimes it is precisely the opposite, a mistaken modern trend away from an old and sound custom. The breakdown of the modern American family is an instance in point.

Other writers have defined social problems in terms of social disorganization,[7] or in terms of the individual's failure to participate normally in the life of the group.[8] It is unnecessary for the present purpose to follow out in detail these and other vagaries of the modern sociological mind, particularly since all these viewpoints have one essential

principle in common — all of them assume that the ordinary life of the modern community is somehow the standard. In their view, then, whatever is out of conformity with this standard is a departure from the mores, a cultural lag, a rift in our social organization, an obstacle to full participation in current life — and therefore a social problem.

It is a curious fact that the social scientists who profess to reject ethics do not actually do so. Ethics is a branch of knowledge which sets up standards for human conduct, standards of what ought and what ought not to be done. If a sociologist should really reject all ethics of whatever sort, he would be wholly unable to recognize a social problem when he saw one. If he really remained ethically neutral, he would have no reason to prefer a society in which murder and robbery and rape had been eliminated to a society in which these types of conduct were rife. How could such a man possibly write a book on criminology? Criminology must begin with the assumption that certain actions are somehow wrong, or pathological, or undesirable, and that it is a good thing for society to try to suppress them.

What unbelieving social scientists actually do is merely to reject all *formal* systems of ethics. Then they fall back on a very naïve sort of folk ethics — hardly an improvement from the standpoint of precise and rigorous thinking. Once a man distinguishes between desirable and undesirable conduct, he has set up a system of ethics — and the social scientists do just that when they write about social problems. But their ethics is a very crude sort of folk ethics because they take what others do as their ethical standard. No very reflective person would be likely to accept the mores of the group as his criteria of conduct. But in this field the social scientist is not very reflective. He is really a very simple soul, and he seems to be quite well satisfied with his simple system of folk ethics.

The writings of professional sociologists have been quoted because they put into words, fairly well, the current state

of opinion, which is also reflected by newspaper editorials, political platforms, books, periodicals, and by the everyday conversation of the man on the street. Quite generally, current opinion agrees with the sociologists in rejecting the facts of revelation and in thinking of society in purely natural terms. Having rejected revelation they have proceeded to reject sound natural ethics as well. This is quite a natural consequence. For, although it is theoretically possible to build a sound ethical system by the light of reason alone, such a result is seldom attained in actual practice. Plato, a man of brilliant intellect and great moral earnestness, devoted his whole life to the serious pursuit of philosophy; yet, even he erred seriously on ethical matters, as when he advocated a communism of wives and children among the ruling class of his ideal commonwealth. It is scarcely to be wondered at then if modern pagans fall into a state of intellectual confusion like that described by St. Paul: "They are without excuse, seeing that, although they knew God, they did not glorify him as God or give thanks, but became vain in their reasonings, and their senseless minds have been darkened. For while professing to be wise they have become fools."[9]

Having rejected all absolute standards of right and wrong, it is not surprising that both the professional sociologist and the man on the street fall back on the mores, the currently accepted principles of modern society, as their norm for assaying social problems. But the man on the street applies this poor standard even less intelligently than the sociologist. If prevalent opinion tolerates the persecution of the Negro, then he accepts this state of affairs as right, or at least as inevitable. If the current slogan is "My country right or wrong," then he adopts this thoroughly immoral principle, because he has no absolute standard of right and wrong by which to refute it. Thus man's mores, instead of God's law, become the norm of

morality. "They have changed the glory of the incorruptible God for an image made like to corruptible man."[10]

Since the materialistic sociologist is so confused in his conception of the nature of social problems, it is not surprising that the remedies he proposes are equally wide of the mark. First of all, the materialist, by rejecting the supernatural, destroys the essential purpose of our common life. In the present order man's destiny is to know and love God supernaturally; either directly and proximately, or indirectly and remotely, this supreme purpose must dominate all social living. Any social activity which interferes with this supreme purpose is already a social problem. The materialist does not know this, and thus he is, obviously, incompetent to discuss either the ills of society or their remedies.

A second evil also follows from the rejection of the supernatural. Grace as an aid to right social living is discarded. This is exceedingly serious for in his present state man, unless aided by grace, is morally incapable of keeping the whole natural law and overcoming all his grave temptations.[11] Catholics have both the teaching of revelation to give them standards of conduct and the means of grace to help them follow those standards. Materialists, by rejecting both the one and the other, make a good society doubly impossible.

Materialistic sociologists are not content with rejecting the supernatural. They reject also all absolute standards of right and wrong. In doing so they discard the voice of conscience as a sanction for right social living, and thereby place still another obstacle in the way of the solution of social problems. The man who recognizes an absolute ethical standard knows that he has duties which he must perform even when he is not urged to them by the sanctions of human law. Though a policeman is not watching him, he must still do what is right and avoid what is wrong. But if absolute standards are discarded this is no longer

the case. If such standards go by the board, if the voice of conscience is silenced, then there is no reason why a man should do what society expects of him, unless he is coerced. In the Catholic view coercion should merely supplement conscience. The materialist rejects the latter, so he must by all logic fall back upon the former. Coercion becomes the sole means of social control. Since of all societies the State is best able to coerce, there follows a drift toward State regimentation with its logical culmination in the totalitarian State. Once materialism is granted as a premise, totalitarianism eventually follows as a necessary conclusion.

The Catholic viewpoint on social problems and their remedies is utterly and completely different from the materialistic viewpoint which has just been described. Catholic social thought is dominated by the fact that man is destined for heaven. Neither society itself nor the problems of society can be understood without taking this fact into account. The Catholic social ideal is quite literally heaven on earth. "Our citizenship is in heaven."[12] In heaven we are to enjoy a supernatural knowledge of God, the beatific vision, and a supernatural love of God, the beatific love. It is the divine plan that on this earth also we should know God supernaturally by faith and love Him supernaturally by charity. Thus we are to reproduce here as perfectly as we can the life of the blessed in heaven. The latter is our true life; heaven is our fatherland. On this earth we ought, like homesick exiles in a strange environment, to strive to practice the type of common life by which our fatherland is characterized. Hence, it is true that our citizenship, our genuine social ideal, is in heaven.

Since man is destined for heaven, all the common activities of a well-ordered society must contribute toward that end, either directly or indirectly, either immediately or remotely. The Church makes a direct contribution by teaching her revealed doctrine and administering the sacraments. The State makes an indirect contribution, for example, by

preserving external order, without which the practice of virtue would become more difficult. Even such a humble society as a baseball club plays its minor part, for wholesome recreation is not without importance in the Christian life. Every legitimate social activity helps, at least in some very remote way, to lead men to heaven. Every social activity which hinders the process, whether it be a race riot, or a heresy, or a rape, is illegitimate and constitutes a social problem.

Looking at society from the Catholic standpoint, one cannot but wonder why social problems should exist at all. The Christian social ideal would seem to be completely satisfying. In this world it promises a peaceful and well-ordered society in which love moves the strong to aid the weak, in which the consolations of faith solace the inevitable ills to which flesh is heir; in the world to come it promises the eternal joy of the society of the blessed in heaven. Yet, this social ideal, which Christ proclaimed, is everywhere flouted. Instead of peace we have war. Instead of love we have hatred. Instead of Christian hope we have an almost universal despair. Why is this?

Catholic thought recognizes that here there is a mystery. The ills of society cannot be explained in purely human terms. "The mystery of iniquity," says St. Paul in his second epistle to the Thessalonians, "is already at work."[13] These highly disturbing words teach us that a malign force is operating in this familiar world of ours, and that this force is hidden and mysterious in nature. To comprehend social evil its influence must be taken into account. To understand social problems it is not enough to trace the effect of known and recognizable factors, man's innate selfishness, perverse social philosophies, or the imperfect organization of society. These things do not adequately explain the social evil which plagues us. We must also reckon with the mystery of iniquity. To overlook it is to be unrealistic.

Why the *mystery* of iniquity? The word mystery always implies something which is obscure either because it is secret or because it is beyond our comprehension.[14] Probably both categories of meaning apply in the present connection. The mystery of iniquity is mysterious because it is secret — the forces of evil operate in devious and hidden ways. But it is mysterious also by its very nature, for it represents a degree of evil which passes our comprehension.

Human intelligence, after all, is rather limited in its scope. There are degrees of goodness which we cannot understand. No man can grasp the surpassing excellence of the angelic nature, much less, the infinite perfection of God. Likewise, there are depths of evil which mortal mind cannot fathom. Even the malice of human sin is not fully comprehensible to us; for in a sense it is infinite.[15] Its frightfulness lies beyond our imagination. Sometimes terrified saints have been permitted a brief glance at this unspeakable thing and they came out of their meditations in a cold sweat, gasping with horror. The rest of us can only rely on our faith which teaches us that sin is terrible beyond comprehension. If we cannot understand human sin, how much less can we understand the mystery of iniquity! For even though we could comprehend the full moral evil of a degraded criminal, a parricide, a traitor, a sexual pervert, yet this secret would still elude us. Down below the nethermost reaches of merely human malice there exists an abyss of iniquity to which the worst human sin would be only as the naughtiness of a willful child. It is here that the mystery of iniquity belongs, and against us this incomprehensible evil is ceaselessly at work.

We cannot understand the mystery of iniquity, but we can at least understand why it is incomprehensible to us, why it deserves to be called a "mystery." For this purpose the phrase must be replaced in its context. St. Paul's Thessalonian converts were highly disturbed by the notion that the end of the world was at hand. The Apostle reassures

them by reminding them that this event is to be preceded by certain definite signs which have not yet appeared. One sign is the "apostasy," apparently a religious revolt of unparalleled magnitude. Another is the appearance of Antichrist, "the man of sin . . . the son of perdition."[16] These things belong to the future, but even now, adds St. Paul, "the mystery of iniquity is already at work" and will so continue until a certain obstacle whose nature is obscure to us "is gotten out of the way."[17] With the removal of the obstacle Antichrist will appear, the mystery of iniquity will have its full effect, and the end of the world will be approaching.[18]

Like Antichrist himself, then, the mystery of iniquity is an evil associated with the events which are to precede the end of the world; but it is *already* operative. The Apocalyptic forces which will make the last days a time of horror do not belong exclusively to the far distant future. They are already at work, though in an obscure and dark manner. This being the case, it is important to try to identify them as they exist in our contemporary world. Obviously this is no easy task because the mystery of iniquity is by its very nature a hidden thing. But some light can be thrown on the problem by an examination of the scripture passage in which the mystery of iniquity is mentioned.

The coming of Antichrist, says St. Paul, will be "with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all wicked deception."[19] The disappearance of the "obstacle" will, by releasing the mystery of iniquity, give play to the use of power and deception against the Kingdom of God. Since this mystery is *already* at work, it is reasonable to suppose that it *now* uses such power and such deception to the same end, although more secretly and with less success than will be the case when the end of the world approaches.

Further light is thrown on these matters by the Apocalypse, a book of the New Testament which also describes the evil forces which are to prevail in the last days. Here

two great beasts are mentioned which are to be active against the Kingdom of God. There is the Beast of the Sea which is given "authority over every tribe, and people, and tongue, and nation."[20] This seems to typify the use of force for iniquitous purposes by evil civil governments. Then there is the Beast of the Earth which "leads astray the inhabitants of the earth, by reason of the signs which it was permitted to do."[21] This typifies the use of deception. Thus, the symbolism of these Apocalyptic beasts once more makes it clear that force and deceit, "all power" and "all wicked deception," are the characteristic weapons of the mystery of iniquity.

Does this use of force and deception against the work of Christ have any direct *social* significance? One might conceivably argue that it does not, on the theory that it refers to diabolical temptations directed against the individual and not to the operation of organized forces in society. There is plenty of evidence, however, that this is not the case. The mystery of iniquity acts socially, through the agency of human groups. This is clear from a consideration of the New Testament concept of the *world*. This word bears various meanings in the Holy Scriptures. The particular sense with which we are concerned in the present discussion is rather special and, one might say, technical. For the New Testament writers often use the word to refer to the totality of those who refuse to accept the Gospel of Christ and to obey His law.[22] It is essential to realize that the persons who make up the world (in this sense) are not a mere unorganized congeries of human beings. They are an ordered social whole, a society. The world is called a "kingdom," and Satan is called "the prince of the world."[23] The world, then, is the Kingdom of Satan striving in malign opposition to the Kingdom of God. Just as the latter has for its purpose to unite men to Christ, to sanctify them, and to lead them to heaven, so the former exists to attach them to Satan, to corrupt them, and to plunge them into

hell. It is not too much even to speak of the world as the Mystical Body of Satan, through which men are united to the devil in a most intimate personal union, which is somewhat parallel to the union of the faithful with Christ in His Mystical Body.[24]

It is apparent from the preceding discussion that the mystery of iniquity is a mystery both in the sense of being something secret and hidden and in the sense that it is beyond human comprehension. It is apparent, too, that it operates through the use of power and deception against the Kingdom of God and, finally, that it is aided in its machinations by an organized society called "the world" or (synonymously) "the kingdom of this world," that is, the Kingdom of Satan. In the light of these facts it is now possible to face the question directly: What is the mystery of iniquity in itself?

Obviously this is not an easy question to answer; for we are dealing with a mysterious and secret thing. The most plausible answer, however, would seem to be that the mystery of iniquity is the Satanic plan to frustrate the work of Christ, together with whatever is associated with this plan. What makes this answer highly probable is St. Paul's parallel use of the word *mystery* to describe the divine plan to redeem mankind through Christ, which he calls "the mystery which has been kept in silence from eternal ages, which is manifested now through the writings of the prophets according to the precept of the eternal God, and made known to all the Gentiles to bring about obedience to faith"; the mystery of iniquity thus becomes the exact antithesis of "the mystery of godliness" of which the Apostle speaks to Timothy.[25]

The alignment of forces which operate against the Kingdom of God is thus made plain. There is, first of all, the mystery of iniquity, the Satanic plan to bring to naught the saving work of Jesus Christ. There is, secondly, the world, the Kingdom of Satan, an organized society which

works to carry out this sinister purpose. Finally, there are the means which the world uses in doing so and these means are force and deception. Now a further question remains to be answered: How are these various entities to be identified? The mystery of iniquity is by its nature inscrutable, but the world is an organized society. The latter, at least, should be visible and identifiable. How and where is it to be found?

The science of apologetics teaches that the Kingdom of God may be identified by four marks. It is one, holy, catholic, and apostolic. Using these marks as clues, one can identify the Catholic Church as the concrete and visible Kingdom of God among us. The *world* can be sought out and recognized in a parallel fashion. It also has its marks and these are two: opposition to the work of Christ and use of violence and deception to this end. By using these clues, one ought to be able to discover in our current civilization the concrete and visible embodiment of the Kingdom of Satan.

Before following out this line of thought a word of warning is in order. It is useless to expect to find the Kingdom of Satan, the world, embodied in an organization as definite and as clearly outlined as the Church, its great antithesis. What will be found is a group of forces which at first glance appear separate and independent but which on closer examination prove to be interlocking, so that in spite of their seeming separateness they actually cooperate surprisingly well against the Kingdom of God.

What are these forces? It is not the purpose of the present chapter to attempt to answer this question in any detail; but it will be worth while to give, by way of illustration, a few examples of the operation of the Kingdom of Satan in the modern world. To discover this kingdom at work one must return to the clues mentioned above and ask: "What are the current social forces which oppose the work of Christ and use violence and deception as their instruments?"

It is easy enough to discover certain sociopolitical movements which answer to this description. Communism is one of these. It opposes the work of Christ; indeed it is the unique example in all history of a *total* war against the Divinity. "For the first time in history," wrote Pope Pius XI, "we are witnessing a struggle, cold-blooded in purpose and mapped out to the last detail, between man and 'all that is called God.' Communism is by its very nature anti-religious."[26] In its anti-Christian struggle communism uses force. In Russia and Mexico "bishops and priests were exiled, condemned to forced labor, shot and done to death in inhuman fashion."[27] In Spain it was responsible for "the indiscriminate slaughter of bishops, of thousands of priests and religious of both sexes."[28] To accomplish its evil purpose communism uses deception. Pope Pius stated that it employs "a propaganda so truly diabolical that the world has perhaps never witnessed its like before."[29]

What is true of Russian communism is true also, in its degree, of the former Italian Fascism and of German Nazism. There can be no possible doubt that Mussolini's and Hitler's movements have been anti-Christian forces. Their use of violence and deceit are too notorious to require proof. Nor can there be any doubt that Nazism particularly has opposed the work of Christ. Pope Pius XI spoke of "machinations that from the very beginning had no other aim than a war of extermination" against the Catholic Church.[30]

Even the nontotalitarian States, in many ways, actively or passively, do the work of the Kingdom of Satan. The movement for Godless education is surely an anti-Christian movement; yet in many public school systems it has received the august approval of the State. Those who promote easy divorce and the practice of contraception are doing Satan's work, and they find the State very generally acquiescent. Universal conscription, even in time of peace, is the cause of a great many evils,[31] while militaristic propaganda

is a direct cause of war. The fact that so many governments have approved these abuses shows the influence of the mystery of iniquity. Selfish economic groups have used violence and deceit in their quest of wealth and yet more wealth, and they have been little restrained by law. It is not surprising that Pope Pius XI spoke of "a certain degradation of the majesty of the State which is becoming a slave, delivered and bound over to the service of human passion and greed, whereas it should be enthroned like a queen and supreme judge, above all party contention and intent solely on the common welfare and on justice."[32]

To win men away from Christ by the systematic use of deceit is one of the marks of the Kingdom of Satan. How clearly this mark appears in the work of most non-Catholic universities! Professing to be entirely objective and unprejudiced in their investigations, their faculties are actually gripped by a dogged materialistic bias which no arguments and no evidence can unsettle. Their dogmatic materialism infects successive generations of students and seeps out into society at large. Writers of fiction weave it into their plots. It colors the editorials of the daily press. Gradually, almost unconsciously, it becomes a philosophy of life for large groups of people.

The foregoing considerations must make it clear that social problems cannot be understood entirely in purely human terms. The mystery of iniquity must be taken into account. On the other hand, it would be a mistake to exclude the effect of natural factors entirely. Even if there were no such thing as the mystery of iniquity, human muddleheadedness and the inconstancy of the will would create problems for society. So, too, would such natural misfortunes as droughts and floods and plagues. Such is man's nature and such are the conditions of his existence that society would always be troubled with problems quite apart from all diabolical intervention.

Even where the mystery of iniquity is at work, its activ-

ity does not usually appear on the surface of events; rather, it operates through secondary natural causes. Therefore, when one traces the causes of social problems, one finds that the immediate reasons for these problems are quite natural and quite understandable by human reason. It is only by following the chain of causation back far enough that one is led to suspect the workings of the Kingdom of Satan. What, for example, causes wars? Often the chain of cause and effect is something like this: The immediate cause is some comparatively trifling international incident. Behind this, perhaps, lies the inordinate ambition of some king or dictator. But an individual's ambition would be ineffective were it not for the support he receives from his subjects. He would not have this support except that there existed a widespread false philosophy of extreme nationalism which makes the will of the government the norm of morality and expresses itself in the slogan, "My country right or wrong." Thus the cause of the war is finally traced back to a deep-seated and widespread perverse attitude of modern men, and this attitude reflects the activity of the Kingdom of Satan.

It is usual, then, to find that a given social problem has immediate natural causes which are discoverable by the light of reason, while down beneath these apparent causes the mystery of iniquity is at work. The Catholic attack on social problems must take both of these into account. Catholics must be concerned with natural factors underlying the evils of society and to meet these they must use the natural methods suggested by experience. For this reason the Church favors social legislation, collective bargaining, effective law enforcement, international arbitration, public health activities, efficient social work, and all other up-to-date methods of meeting social problems. In this respect Catholic social thinking shows a strong superficial resemblance to the thought of non-Catholic writers. But mark the difference carefully! Whereas these techniques are

the sole solution of the unbelieving sociologist for all social problems, in the eyes of the Catholic they are only a sort of symptomatic treatment. The Catholic sees deeper, and realizes that far beneath the immediate causes the mystery of iniquity is at work and that his real solution is to attack the latter. The unbelieving social scientist is like a physician who gives a sedative to a patient suffering from a brain tumor and does nothing more. The Catholic is like a physician who gives the sedative indeed but then proceeds to the difficult and delicate operation which brings a permanent cure.

Only the Catholic has a fundamental remedy for social problems, for only the Catholic diagnoses the basic cause, which is the mystery of iniquity. To attack this he must use supernatural means. Therefore he must rely on such methods as prayer, the sacraments, the practice of the Christian virtues. This is the constant teaching of the social encyclicals. The point cannot be fully developed at present; but it is worth while to cite one example. Pope Leo XIII, speaking of the class struggle which involves "arrogance, asperity, fraud on the part of the more powerful, misery, envy, turbulence on the part of the poor," went on to say that "it is vain to seek a remedy for these evils in legislation, in the threat of penalties, or in the devices of human prudence."[33] He proceeded to argue that for such evils the spirit of charity is the antidote and that we should therefore seek the solution of the problem in the Holy Eucharist, the great source of charity.

We Catholics have a precious possession in our doctrine of the mystery of iniquity. In it we have the key to the solution of the many problems which torture our weary world. Realizing as we do that the mystery of iniquity is the basic cause of these problems, we can attack them at their source by the use of supernatural means. Herein lies our hope of victory. On the other hand, unbelievers have only the devices of human prudence on which to rely, and

these are bound to fail. As well try to sink a battleship with a peashooter as to attack the great problems of society with such puny weapons!

It remains for us Catholics to take full advantage of the supernatural means which are our precious possession. When we cast to the winds all the mean counsels of a purely worldly prudence, when we turn for our principles to the New Testament and to the whole grand doctrinal tradition of the Church applied so concretely to modern problems in the great encyclicals, when we accept quite literally with childlike faith these precious revealed doctrines, when we put aside all cringing concern for the opinion of materialists, then we shall begin to make progress against the mystery of iniquity. Until that day we shall only be marking time.

Chapter 2

CATHOLIC CONFORMISM

FROM the considerations of the last chapter one corollary necessarily follows. Since there is a radical antithesis between the Catholic viewpoint on the root cause of social problems and the current materialistic viewpoint, Catholic social action must be fundamentally different from the type of social action which is current in the modern world. The contradiction between the two systems of thought and action is too plain to be disregarded. In all logic one is forced to choose the one or the other; and there can be no doubt which alternative a Catholic must choose. He must break sharply with materialistic social philosophy and faithfully follow out to all its logical consequences his own distinctive system of social doctrine.

Whereas the materialist scoffs at the very suggestion that devils exist, the Catholic must frankly profess that they do exist and that they are a constant sinister influence in human affairs. Whereas the materialist stubbornly refuses to admit the operation of any but natural causes, the Catholic must recognize that the mystery of iniquity is already at work. In spite of the materialist's derision, the Catholic must confess that the Kingdom of Satan exists and that it plays its part in the events of history.

Genuine Catholic social action bears a partial and superficial resemblance, in some of its aspects, to the social action which materialists propose; but fundamentally it is altogether different. For Catholics must not put all their faith in the efficacy of natural means; they must show a practical reliance on supernatural means as well. They

must accept prayer and the sacraments as real and efficient techniques of social action. This is a point on which Catholics and unbelievers cannot ever possibly agree.

These things are so perfectly plain and clear and obvious that no Catholic can logically hesitate for an instant to accept them. Yet some Catholics do hesitate — in defiance of all logic. They betray their hesitation, not by positively denying any supernatural social doctrine, but by talking as though such doctrines did not exist. They can discuss the sociology of the family by the hour without ever once mentioning marriage as a sacrament. They can discourse learnedly about the evils of modern war but not from the standpoint of the doctrine of the Mystical Body. It never occurs to them to propose the Holy Eucharist as the fundamental remedy for the class struggle. They remain consistently silent about all those social doctrines which are peculiar to the Catholic Church. Thus they convey the impression that they do not differ basically from materialists in their social thought. No one would gather from their language that there is a sharp antithesis between the viewpoints of Catholics and unbelievers on social questions. Such persons may be appropriately dubbed *Catholic conformists;* for they are Catholics in the sense that they deny no doctrine of the Church outright and they are conformists in that they conform as closely as they dare to the viewpoint of unbelievers.

It is vain to seek a logical explanation for the existence of Catholic conformism. The phenomenon cannot be explained by logic. It can be explained only in terms of cowardice. It requires unusual courage to break sharply with current opinion, and this courage the conformist lacks. So he tries to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. He attempts to retain the respect of both Catholics and unbelievers. Of course, in the long run the attempt is bound to fail; but to the timid soul of the Catholic conformist it seems the easiest course.

To understand the psychological roots of conformism one must realize what a variety of cruel punishments society has devised for those who dissent sharply and obviously from the opinions of the dominant majority. At some times and in some places the punishment is the prison cell, the concentration camp, or the firing squad. These dramatic penalties, however, are by no means society's only resources for bringing the dissident into line. Even where freedom of speech and opinion are legally assured, even where the State takes no official cognizance of a man's views, there remains an infinite variety of devious and subtle ways of penalizing the nonconformist.

First of all, the dissident individual is punished by withholding rewards. Most men desire those things which are commonly accounted the marks of "success." They desire a good job and the money which goes with it. They desire positions of authority. They desire the type of social prestige which makes them acceptable in the more exclusive circles of society. Such rewards are not for those who differ too obviously from majority opinion on really important issues. Consider, for example, the lot of such divergent groups as, say, Holy Rollers, pacifists, Jehovah's Witnesses, communists, Hindus, spiritualists. It is irrelevant in the present connection to ask whether the members of such groups are right or wrong, high-minded or selfish; the point is that they are "different" and are known as such. They do not quite "belong." They are less likely than other people to be chosen as judges or bank presidents or aldermen, to be elected to the Rotary or the local country club. Their wives will probably not be invited to social functions by the "best people." Indeed, even minor degrees of unconformity are a real disadvantage. It does not pay for a congressman to be even mildly critical of popular catchwords, or for a businessman to be a bit too sympathetic to labor unions. Even such a trivial thing as dress may count. A man whose dress is noticeably unconventional may lose

a promotion to another when the decision is close and other things are equal.

Ridicule is a very effective means for suppressing divergent opinion. Most persons are easily terrified by ridicule. Moral courage seems to be a rarer virtue than physical courage. Many a man who has no very strong patriotic convictions will enlist as a soldier because he is afraid to be ridiculed as a "slacker." Apparently the guns of the enemy are less terrible to him than the gibes of his friends. It requires a bit of real heroism to stand up for one's convictions when they make one the butt of jokes and insults. It is this terrible power of public ridicule which society uses, among other devices, to force conformity to majority opinion. Is it any wonder that so few people dare to profess those opinions which will draw ridicule upon themselves?

Just as society punishes the expression of divergent views, so it rewards conformity. The man who agrees with dominant opinion is looked upon as "sound" and "reliable." He may even get a reputation for clear thinking, which is probably the last thing in the world he deserves. If he has ability and luck he may become a leader in the community. If he lacks these and remains all his life in some humble position, even then he enjoys some real advantages. The leading men in the community have a good opinion of him. In time of business depression he is less likely than others to lose his job. He can ask and obtain minor favors. He can get his son an appointment on the police force or have his daughter appointed a teacher in the public schools. It pays to be conventional in one's views.

The pressure of majority opinion is likely to have a deep psychological effect on the individual. If he agrees with others he enjoys a subtle sense of well-being. He is at one with his fellows. Though his own personal successes may be small, he enjoys a vicarious satisfaction in the successes of the group of which he feels himself a part. On the other hand, the man who disagrees feels uncomfortably that he

is a pariah. In the course of every day a thousand trivial incidents reinforce this feeling. He picks up a newspaper and he is irritated by the editorials and the presentation of the news. He goes to the movies and he cannot yield up his emotions to the plot because the plot offends his convictions. He falls in with a stranger on a railroad train and difference of opinion puts a wall between him and his new acquaintance. Unless the man sets a very high price on his intellectual integrity, these repeated petty irritations finally engender something like a feeling of guilt. He tries to argue away his own convictions because continued disagreement is so unpleasant. If he is a coward, he succeeds.

To hold unpopular views on any subject can lead to unpleasantness. To hold unpopular views on such a vital subject as society itself can lead to actual persecution. Therefore timid Catholics hesitate, and by hesitating place themselves in a most painful dilemma. If they frankly reject Catholic social doctrine, they put themselves outside the pale of the Church, which is something they do not want to do. On the other hand, if they frankly and freely profess this doctrine in its entirety, then they break sharply with current American opinion and begin to incur the penalties just discussed.

Of course, it was the intention of Christ that His followers should do precisely this, that they should make a clean break with the world and its cheap philosophy and that they should suffer the consequences. "Blessed shall you be," He said, "when men hate you, and when they shut you out, and reproach you, and reject your name as evil, because of the Son of Man. Rejoice on that day and exult, for behold your reward is great in heaven."[1] On the other hand, when Catholics are not punished by society for being Catholics, there is something wrong with them. It is an abnormal condition of affairs when they are not persecuted for their opinions. "Woe to you when all men speak well of you!"[2]

Timid Catholics, however, hesitate to assume their normal burden of suffering and to accept persecution for the sake of their opinions. Therefore they take refuge in Catholic conformism. It is easy to understand why they do so; on a superficial view it looks like a way out of their dilemma. The fact which makes Catholic conformism possible is that there actually are a number of points on which Catholics and unbelievers can apparently agree. Thus both groups can admit that municipal graft is a bad thing, that most crimes of violence should be suppressed, that some extremes of poverty should be relieved. These propositions are so obvious that hardly anyone would question them. Then there are other points which are not so universally admitted outside the Church but which are still held by large groups of unbelievers. Thus many infidels favor the principles of collective bargaining and certain forms of social legislation which the encyclicals also approve. By advocating clamorously these things and by remaining studiously silent about the social significance of the Holy Eucharist, the union of Church and State, the Catholic doctrine on extreme nationalism, hell as a penalty for social evil, and all such unpopular teachings, one may try to make oneself acceptable to materialistic social thinkers without breaking with the Church. Indeed by choosing one's steps cautiously it may even be possible to build up quite a reputation as a leader of Catholic social thought.

Catholic conformism is fundamentally dishonest because it professes to find a common ground with unbelievers, whereas such a common ground is not possible in any real sense. It is true enough that Catholics and materialists can agree on certain immediate practical measures, and therefore both groups can to a certain extent do their work side by side in economic and political life. But the ultimate reasons why Catholics and materialists advocate this or that measure are as different as they can possibly be. Catholics can maintain an appearance of agreement only

by keeping a constant guilty silence about their real social doctrine, by systematically suppressing all reference to the supernatural when the pros and cons of some social issue are being discussed. At the price of this guilty silence they are able to create the impression that their agreement with unbelievers is deep, whereas it actually cannot be other than superficial. This dishonest silence is the price one must pay to become and remain a Catholic conformist.

The most tragic thing about Catholic conformism is its complete ineffectiveness against the mystery of iniquity. For the mystery of iniquity can neither be understood nor combated except by supernatural means, and these supernatural means are precisely the things about which the Catholic conformist remains consciously silent. St. Paul laid down an important principle when he said: "Our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the Principalities and the Powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual forces of wickedness on high."[3] The conformist writes and speaks just as though our wrestling *were* against flesh and blood, as though the mystery of iniquity did not exist. He advocates the use of precisely those natural means which would be effective against flesh and blood, and neglects those which are effective against the Principalities and the Powers. The social action which he advocates is therefore doomed to ineffectiveness.

In the long run the Catholic conformist reaps the fruits of his cowardice. He forfeits the esteem of both camps. All men must respect courage even in their enemies; all must despise faint-heartedness even in their friends. The soldier who would slaughter his enemy without hesitation must still concede him a grudging admiration when he fights bravely. So must an unbeliever respect a Catholic who stands up for his principles without compromise and without counting the cost. But the unbeliever cannot but scorn the Catholic who compromises in order to curry favor

with those who reject his doctrines. The Catholic conformist is neither hot nor cold. He tries to be acceptable to everybody. He seems to have no strong convictions. He is not an admirable character.

The effort to find a middle way which would be acceptable to Catholics on the one hand and to heretics and infidels on the other is an old endeavor of timid Catholics. Of course the effort is doomed to failure. There can be no compromise between truth and falsehood. To say that two and two are five is false in just as strict a sense as to say that two and two are seven. Yet, hopeless as it is, the search for middle grounds goes on from century to century, not only where the social doctrine of the Church is concerned but in all other areas as well. This tendency has been a prolific source of dogmatic error. Thus the Semi-Pelagians tried to compromise with Pelagianism; and the Jansenists, with Calvinism. In the present century Modernism has been the most striking example of the tendency.

Modernism, as the name itself implies, was an attempt to find a compromise between Catholic doctrine and certain trends of modern thought. During the nineteenth century the effects of Kantian criticism had shaken men's confidence in the ability of human reason to attain to objective truth. At the same time the attacks of biblical critics had undermined the faith of many in the literal truth of the Sacred Scriptures. As a result of these tendencies a school of "'liberal" Protestantism arose which substituted a vague religious subjectivism for the definite theological doctrine which old-fashioned Protestants had not entirely abandoned. Liberal Protestants sought the basis of their religion in an ill-defined sentiment springing from the subconscious and no longer in propositions which they believed to have been revealed by God and therefore to be objectively true. The Modernists tried to accommodate Catholic doctrine to this viewpoint. It was one of the great triumphs of Pope Pius X that he clearly demonstrated the inconsistency of this

position with traditional Catholic teaching and purged the Church of Modernism.[4]

This dogmatic Modernism is now outmoded and is no longer a serious threat to the Church. But there has grown up in the meantime a new type of Modernism in the field of social thought. Pope Pius XI was very definite about this. "How many there are," he exclaimed, "who profess Catholic doctrine regarding the State and the obedience due it, the right of private property, the rights and duties of agricultural and industrial laborers, the mutual relations of nations and of employers and employees, the relations between ecclesiastical and civil authority, the rights of the Holy See and the Roman Pontiff, the prerogatives of bishops, and, finally, the rights of Christ Himself, our Creator, Redeemer, and Lord, over individuals and nations — and yet at the same time speak, write, and conduct themselves just as though the doctrine and the frequently repeated precepts of the Popes, of Leo XIII, Pius X, and Benedict XV particularly, had lost their native force or had become completely out of date! In this a certain species of moral, juridical, and social Modernism is recognizable which we strongly condemn along with the familiar dogmatic Modernism."[5]

Pope Pius did not enter into further details on the nature of social Modernism; but the above quotation makes it clear that it combines two characteristics, a profession of loyalty to Catholic social doctrine plus a disregard for the encyclicals. Furthermore, the social Modernists have an exaggerated respect for current opinion. This is shown by the very word *Modernism* which the Holy Father applied to it and by his statement that these people talk as though the encyclicals were "out of date." These are precisely the characteristics of the conformists described above. Would it be rash, then, to assert that social Modernism and Catholic conformism are one and the same thing? Probably not, yet the term *Catholic conformism* will be retained in this

book to avoid the danger of reading into the papal thought some possible features which the Holy Father did not intend.[6]

Without using the term *social Modernism* the Popes have frequently condemned the tendency which it represents, the tendency, that is, to try to solve social problems by purely natural means without regard to the supernatural. There is, for example, the classic statement of Pope Leo XIII: "Some hold — and the opinion is reaching the masses — that the *social question,* as it is called, is exclusively economic. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is primarily moral and religious and therefore its solution is to be sought mainly in the moral law and the dictates of religion. For suppose that wages were doubled; the hours of labor shortened; the cost of living cheapened. If, as now frequently happens, the workingman should hearken to those teachings and follow those examples which tend to undermine reverence for God and to corrupt morals, his labors and earnings would be in vain. Trial and experience have made it clear that many a workingman lives poorly and miserably in spite of shorter hours and higher wages because of his immoral life and lack of religious discipline."[7]

The Holy See has shown scant sympathy for those compromising Catholics who water down their doctrine to make it more acceptable to non-Catholics. Cardinal Merry del Val, writing in the name of Pope Pius X, speaks ironically of "those so-called Catholic projects whose intention seems to be to embrace the maximum possible membership with the minimum possible supernatural conditions."[8] The attitude of the Holy See is made very clear by the history of a French organization called the *Sillon* ("furrow"). Founded in the 1890's by a group of which Marc Sangnier was the leading spirit, the movement was at first thoroughly Catholic in its program of social reform and was praised by Rome. From about 1905, however, it began to lose its completely Catholic character through "liberal and Prot-

estant infiltrations." Pope Pius X reprimanded the leaders for this. "Behold," says the great Pope, "an interconfessional association founded by Catholics to work for the reform of civilization, a work which is in the first place religious; for there is no true civilization without moral civilization and there is no true moral civilization without the true religion." The sad consequence of such a movement is that its Catholic members maintain a guilty silence about their supernatural principles. Pope Pius is delicate in his irony. "What is one to think of a Catholic who checks his Catholicism at the door as he enters his study club so as not to shock his comrades?"[9]

The reasons for the unfavorable attitude of the Holy See toward all that savors of Catholic conformism is brought out very clearly in these quotations. The Catholic ideal must be a civilization based on the supernatural principles of the true religion. Anything short of that is unsatisfactory. Mere material prosperity will not even assure happiness in this life, to say nothing of the life to come. The Catholic conformist who remains silent about his supernatural principles for fear of offending unbelievers thereby discards the only weapons which are effective against the mystery of iniquity.

It is too bad that so many Catholics have lost their sense of horror and disgust at dogmatic error. Had they not done so, they would not be so easily inclined to seek a common ground with heretics and infidels. Perhaps the root cause of their wrong attitude is their failure to distinguish sharply between the error itself and the man who holds the error. The former must be always hated; the latter, never. There should be no difficulty at all in making this distinction. The man whose well-beloved wife is dying of cancer finds no difficulty in loving his wife while he hates the disease. Because his wife is very dear to him, it does not follow that he will love her disease. Quite the contrary will be the case. Just so, a Catholic must love all heretics and infidels with

the strong love of charity, but he should have only an overwhelming disgust for the loathsome errors to which these heretics and infidels are a prey. The Catholic in the modern world must constantly rub shoulders with unbelievers. He should not love these men tepidly because of their errors; neither should he abominate the errors the less because they are the errors of his friends.

Catholics can never make their rightful contribution to social reform until they set a very high price on the dogmatic truths that are theirs. These are the truths which Christ Himself brought to the world. These are the truths which countless martyrs loved so well that they died rather than abandon the smallest part of them. Without these truths a basic cure for the ills of society is impossible. To overlook them, to abandon them even in part, or to underemphasize them is to render ourselves ineffective against the mystery of iniquity. To hold them uncompromisingly, without conforming to the spirit of the world to the slightest degree, is a sure road to success.

Chapter 3

THE EXCUSES OF THE CONFORMISTS

ONE may well ask how the Catholic conformist can fall into so obvious an error. Why does he continue to discuss human society in purely natural terms without due regard for the supernatural teaching of his Church? Why does he constantly propose natural means of social action to cope with the mystery of iniquity, as though our wrestling were against flesh and blood and not against the Principalities and the Powers? How can he defend his untenable stand? As a matter of fact, the attempt is frequently made to justify the conformist position, and it is fair to give this defense a hearing. The standard argument runs something like this:

"We are far from denying the importance of the supernatural for the theoretical understanding of social problems or the efficacy of supernatural means for their practical solution. As loyal Catholics we accept the whole teaching of the Church as stated clearly in the social encyclicals. But if the supernatural is infinitely precious, it does not therefore follow that the natural is valueless. Even in the encyclicals the Popes use the arguments of natural ethics and they advocate the use of natural means of social reform, such as collective bargaining. We see certain definite advantages in using arguments and advocating means based on natural reason. Non-Catholics can see the force of such arguments and thus they are led to take a more favorable attitude toward our position. Furthermore, they are thus given a basis on which they can cooperate with us. After all, we Catholics are a rather small minority in the United

States. By ourselves we are politically ineffective. If we can induce non-Catholics to join with us on the basis of natural truth, then we can accomplish something. On the other hand, if we intransigently insist on our full supernatural doctrine, we shall be isolated and our efforts will be futile."

One must concede that there is a considerable element of truth in this argument. It is clear that the Church has never condemned the proper use of natural methods of studying society nor the proper use of natural means of solving social problems. The point is too well known to require demonstration. It is unfortunate that in the United States and Canada certain Catholics have carried their revolt against conformism to the opposite extreme and have fallen into a sort of exaggerated supernaturalism. These persons deny, or seem to deny, the validity of the natural good. They make such statements as the following: "A priest preaches Christianity when he preaches against what is naturally good, not when he preaches against sin. . . . Do not attack sin — attack the naturally good."[1]

It is hard to understand what a Catholic means when he thus forthrightly condemns the naturally good. The term *naturally good* is perhaps a bit ambiguous. Does it refer to the ethically good, what theologians call the *bonum honestum?* To condemn this outright is certainly a mistake. Take the most unfavorable case. An infidel who has never heard of the Gospel does something which is thoroughly in accord with right reason. Suppose, moreover, that he is not aided by actual grace. His act is in no sense supernatural. It is only naturally good. Yet good it indubitably is as the official teaching of the Church has made abundantly clear.[2] If the ethically right acts even of an infidel cannot be condemned, there seems to be much less reason to condemn such acts when they are performed by a Catholic in the state of grace. In all probability such acts must be considered not merely naturally good but supernatural

and meritorious, even when they are performed without a conscious and explicit supernatural motive.[3]

If the term *naturally good* refers to good in the sense of pleasure, the *bonum delectabile* of the theologians, then a distinction is called for. It is true that to seek pleasure in such forms and under such circumstances as offend right reason is wrong. It is wrong to make pleasure an end in itself. But to seek pleasure in a reasonable way, in order to recreate the mind and body and prepare them for the further service of the Lord, is certainly commendable. The Catholic ascetic ideal is not to eliminate pleasure from one's life but to keep it in its due place. One does not become a saint by making oneself as unhappy as possible. Those dour souls who believe the contrary should read St. Thomas' admirable discussion of recreation and its part in the Christian life.[4] Better still, they should meditate on the wedding feast at Cana.

Finally, *naturally good* may refer to what is good in the sense of being useful. Theologians call this the *bonum utile*. What is merely useful is by definition not an end in itself but a means to some further good. Obviously an act which is directed toward an evil end is itself evil. But something which is not wrong in itself and is sought as a means to a commendable end is good. For example, money is useful. When it is expended for good purposes, say, to relieve the necessities of the poor, it is itself a good. When it is used evilly, it is evil. The same reasoning applies to other things whose principal characteristic is their adaptability as means toward ends which lie beyond themselves. Quite clearly, the *bonum utile* does not deserve an unqualified condemnation.

It is certain, then, that what is naturally good cannot be censured simply because it is natural and not supernatural. It follows that the Catholic conformists cannot be blamed precisely because they value natural truth and natural means of social reform. To do so would be to fall

into an exaggerated supernaturalism which is not in accord with the mind of the Church. In so far as the conformists use sound methods based on natural reason to study society, they are to be praised, not blamed. They are to be praised also when they apply valid natural measures to relieve the ills of society. They merit criticism, not precisely by their emphasis on the natural, but precisely by their parallel underemphasis on the supernatural.

The good, as the old saying goes, is the enemy of the best. The farmer who is so absorbed in his work that he misses Mass on Sunday sins, not because farming is wrong in itself, but because he allows his duties on the farm to interfere with a higher duty. In a parallel fashion the Catholic conformist who is so absorbed in his natural social science that he neglects the supernatural social doctrine of the Church makes a tragic mistake, not because there is anything wrong about the former, but because he allows himself to be distracted from the latter which is infinitely more important in itself. This will become clearer in the light of a couple of examples.

Consider, then, the case of a Catholic publicist who gives a lecture on Negro-white relations in the United States and fails to mention the supernatural aspects of the problem. He quotes the results of the latest surveys. He shows an intelligent appreciation of the viewpoints of both colored and white leaders, and he is judicious in his appreciation of them. The remedies he proposes are sensible and sane. He may even quote papal condemnations of racism. But he has nothing to say about the ultimate basis of such condemnations. He has nothing to say about the great duty of Christian charity which requires us to love all men with an intense supernatural love. He neglects the inspiring doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ and its tragic violation by interracial hatreds. While making no reference to the revealed doctrine of the Church, he is still careful to avoid contradicting it by any positive statement.

What impression will such a speaker leave on the minds of his hearers? It is true that they will not absorb any positive error, but is it not inevitable that they will gain certain false impressions? To the extent to which the speaker has influenced them will they not have learned to consider race relations in purely natural terms? Just to that extent will they not be less likely to think of their duty to love men of other races with Christian charity? Will not the speech have the effect of driving a wedge between the natural and supernatural, and of encouraging the false impression that religion is something to be confined to the church edifice while the problems of society are to be faced from the viewpoint of natural prudence?

The impression from one such lecture will probably not be very deep and hence not very harmful. But when the average Catholic receives the same impression again and again from lectures, books, pamphlets, and articles, the cumulative effect is likely to be deep and permanent. He acquires an ingrained habit of looking at society and social problems from a naturalistic standpoint. If afterwards he reads the social encyclicals, his mental set may be such that he skips hurriedly through the supernatural doctrine they contain and concentrates his attention on those passages alone which are based on sound natural reason. Thus he ends by becoming himself a conformist, a partial Catholic as far as his understanding of society is concerned. He is all the more likely to do this because, as already pointed out, the whole spirit of the age is contrary to the supernatural. Only when he is urged on very emphatically will a man swim against the stream.

In actual practice half the truth may sometimes be as deceptive as an actual falsehood. Suppose, for example, that a professor were engaged to give a course on communism in a Catholic college. Suppose him to be a very brilliant man and a meticulous scholar, very careful of his facts. He gives the course and confines himself exclusively

to facts favorable to communism. He carefully omits any facts unfavorable to the movement. Certainly he would be accused of indoctrinating his students with the communist viewpoint, and the accusation would be just. If he should urge in his defense that he had taught nothing but well-proved facts, no one would take his argument seriously. He showed his bias and gave a false impression by choosing his facts unfairly. He carefully presented the comparatively few facts which are favorable to communism, while omitting the vastly more significant and more numerous facts which are unfavorable to it. The attitude of the Catholic conformist is parallel. He talks about the natural and neglects the supernatural. In doing so he creates a biased impression. It is no defense to urge that he tells the truth. He does not tell all the truth. Without lying, he yet misleads his hearers.

Consider another hypothetical example of Catholic conformism, this time taken from the field of action rather than the field of theory. Suppose that a Catholic labor movement is organized in the United States and that its activities are guided completely by the light of natural reason without explicit consideration of the supernatural. It concerns itself with such questions as wages, hours, unemployment, industrial disease. To benefit the workingman, such means are proposed as strong labor unions, social insurance, minimum wage laws, and the like. It never occurs to the leaders to consider the spiritual problems of the industrial worker, the special moral temptations to which he is exposed, or the special opportunities which his way of life offers for advance in sanctity in imitation of the Carpenter of Nazareth. It never occurs to them to use spiritual techniques to obtain their ends, for example, to organize a crusade of prayer and penance. Such a labor movement is Catholic only in the negative sense that it does not at any point contradict Catholic principles. It is not Catholic in the positive sense that it involves any features which are

exclusively and peculiarly characteristic of Catholic thought.

What effects might one expect from a conformist labor movement of this sort? It might bring many material benefits to the workingman; and this result is certainly laudable. Yet there is grave danger that the impression would arise that labor questions are purely economic, whereas the Church's position is that they are primarily moral and religious. If the relevant religious aspects are not emphasized, what other impression *could* arise? To discuss the problems of the working class exclusively from the natural standpoint is certainly not to express the Catholic attitude. It is more likely to encourage the harsh, materialistic attitude common alike to selfish industrialists and to left-wing radicals.

Again, such a conformist labor movement must fall far short of the ideal by failing to bring to the workingman the benefits which a Catholic movement ought to bring. The worker is more than an economic abstraction. He is a human being destined for heaven. His greatest problem is not how to earn high wages but how to save his soul. To discuss the former objective and neglect the latter is certainly a mistake. A thoroughly Catholic labor movement ought to consider how working-class life can lead not merely to a living wage in this world but to an eternal reward in the next. Judged by this ideal, a conformist type of labor movement appears gravely lacking.

Finally, conformist social action is signally handicapped by refusing the powerful assistance of supernatural means. Faith teaches us that prodigies can be accomplished by prayer. The sacraments have a wonderful power of transforming the souls of men. What a deplorable mistake it is to neglect these potent aids and place one's whole reliance on the devices of human prudence! Yet this is just what the conformist tends to do. What a tragedy this is — to pin one's hope on political maneuvers to the neglect of prayer and penance, or to hope to assuage the bitterness

of the class struggle by laws and conferences and speeches while forgetting the efficacy of the Holy Eucharist!

Conformist social thought does not adequately represent the Catholic position. Conformist social action must be judged inadequate by supernatural standards. But may not at least this much be said for the conformist position, that it makes the Catholic viewpoint more acceptable to unbelievers? May it not serve as a means to lead them gradually to the Church? By seeking a common ground with materialists may we not gain their sympathy so that gradually our common understanding will deepen until they finally begin to appreciate the truth and beauty of Catholic doctrine?

This is a favorite conformist argument, but it is, nevertheless, quite obviously absurd. The conformist who seeks a common ground with unbelievers carefully passes over all that is distinctive of Catholic doctrine. How, then, shall his hearers believe in that which has been systematically concealed from them? "How are they to believe him whom they have not heard? And how are they to hear, if no one preaches?"[5] Indeed, it would seem that the most efficient way of keeping non-Catholics outside the Church would be never to tell them anything about the Church's teaching.

There can be no possible doubt about the right method to use in making converts, the only successful method which the Church has always used from the time of Christ and the Apostles. It may be summed up in three rules. Rule one is to set Catholic doctrine before the unbeliever as clearly as possibly, in its simple essentials for the dull, in all its beautiful complexity for the intelligent. This principle applies to the Church's social teaching as well as to any other. Rule two is to show that one values the truth one teaches as a very precious thing. The martyrs are the very best witnesses to the faith because they show that they value it more than life. The very word *martyr* means *witness*. On the other hand, he who gives the impression

that he is ashamed of the Gospel will convince no one. Rule three is to rely on the grace of God. Supernatural faith is only possible through the aid of divine grace. Therefore the convert-maker must strive through the means of grace to obtain God's supernatural aid.

The Catholic conformist violates all these three rules in so far as he lives up to the principles of Catholic conformism. Because he emphasizes the natural in his writing and speaking, he fails to give a true idea of Catholic social doctrine. He may even give the impression that it is a pale imitation of modern liberalism. Because he is not bold and uncompromising in his statements, he makes men feel that he is apologizing for the Church, that he does not value Catholic doctrine as something infinitely precious. Because he underemphasizes the supernatural, he seems to be trying to persuade his hearers without the help of God's grace. Thus the conformist, in so far as he is a conformist, uses precisely the wrong methods for making converts, and he uses these wrong methods consistently.

A final conformist argument needs to be discussed. It is argued that if the conformist does not make converts by his methods, he at least gains allies. Unbelievers — so the argument runs — cannot be expected to cooperate with Catholics on the basis of Catholic principles; but they may be persuaded to cooperate on the basis of certain sound natural principles which are not inconsistent with Catholic doctrine. Let us therefore put aside for the moment the supernatural teachings of the Church and seek a common ground with heretics and infidels, and thus gain their aid for the social reforms which we desire. Only thus can we become an effective force in a country like the United States which is so predominantly non-Catholic. So the argument goes.

This is weak reasoning. To begin with, the argument tacitly assumes that effective cooperation is impossible without a statement of common principles. This is far

from being the case. It is true, of course, that such a common ground is a good basis for united action, but it is also true that groups may cooperate very effectively for immediate practical ends even though their principles differ radically. Many Catholics who hated child labor nevertheless opposed the Child Labor Amendment as a possible threat to the rights of parents and the Church over the child. Many selfish industrialists who were quite indifferent to rights of the Church and parents opposed the same measure because they wanted to exploit cheap labor. The two groups differed radically in their backgrounds. Yet it is a historical fact that their separate efforts directed toward the same end proved effective.

Consider for a moment what a common social platform drawn up by Catholics on the one hand and heretics and infidels on the other really implies. If such a platform tells the whole truth, it must emphasize the fact that the two groups differ radically on fundamentals. Thus it defeats the purpose of the conformists. If it does not mention these fundamental differences, then it is disingenuous. In the case of any really important social question these differences are glaring. Decent non-Catholics as well as Catholics have reason to be shocked at the high rate of divorce in the United States today, but how far can they agree on the principles of a needed reform when the Church does not even recognize the general authority of the State over the marriage bond? At first glance labor problems may appear to some to be purely economic, but the Church holds that they are primarily moral and religious. If they are religious, how can Catholics draw up a common set of principles for solving such problems with those who differ so completely with the Church on the most fundamental dogmas of religion? There should indeed be cooperation between Catholics and non-Catholics toward social goals. But let it be honest cooperation! Let Catholics be perfectly frank in expressing their social doctrine; then if unbelievers

are willing to cooperate on certain immediate practical measures, let their cooperation be welcome! On the other hand, cooperation purchased at the price of a guilty silence is not even worth discussing.

The conformist effort to secure allies from among the heretics and infidels by remaining silent about certain Catholic social doctrines is wrong not only because it is disingenuous, but especially because it misconceives the nature of Catholic social action by assuming tacitly that the efficacy of such action depends largely on numbers. To get things done we need allies. In the United States only about one person in six is a Catholic. Therefore we can succeed in our efforts at social reform only in so far as we can persuade non-Catholics to cooperate with us. So conformist thought runs.

There is a measure of truth in this line of reasoning, but it is not all the truth. It is true for purely political action, but political action is not identical with social action. Even where they are an insignificant minority, Catholics can have their important effect on society. For the social action of the Church is not just a matter of political stratagems, clever lobbying, and pressure politics. The Church does not place her sole reliance on the use of natural means. "For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but powerful before God to the demolishing of strongholds, the destroying of reasoning — yes, of every lofty thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God."[6]

These are more than fine phrases. The history of the Church has demonstrated that by the use of supernatural means Catholics can exert their leavening influence on society even when political action is impossible to them, and even when they are actually being persecuted. Indeed, the Church has won some of her most brilliant triumphs under conditions which seemed perfectly hopeless from the standpoint of human judgment. Such is the power of supernatural means, those weapons which are powerful before God.

The early Church under the Roman Empire had not the slightest opportunity for political action. It did not have even the legal right to exist. Every common activity of Catholics was carried on against the express prohibition of the laws. Rome was the unchallenged master of the whole known world. The will of her rulers was enforced by a magnificent professional army. The Catholics who defied this mighty power and carried on their illegal activities were not, humanly speaking, an important group. "There were not many wise according to the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble."[7] Catholics in those days did not seek a "common ground" with unbelievers in order to become politically effective. Political action is, of course, entirely legitimate as long as it is honest; but in those days it was impossible and its absence did not greatly handicap the Church. Instead Catholics concentrated on living a perfect social life among themselves. They used supernatural means. "They continued steadfastly in the teaching of the apostles and in the communion of the breaking of the bread and in the prayers."[8] These means of grace created among them a marvelous charity. The rich gave away their possessions to the poor. Masters fraternized with their slaves. "The multitude of the believers were of one heart and one soul."[9]

Fearlessly and in the face of legal prohibitions the Christians preached their doctrine. They preached their *full* doctrine without watering it down to make it more acceptable to the pagans. As a result they were persecuted without mercy, but the prospect of martyrdom only spurred their courage. In the long run this brave Christian life had a marvelous effect on the pagans. They could not but be attracted by its sheer beauty. They could not but be interested in a doctrine for which men were so ready to die. More and more of them became Christians until finally society itself became a Christian society.

There is more than a slight resemblance between our

own days and the days of the early Church. Once more the world has become predominantly pagan. Once more a crass materialism is the spirit of the age. Once more the absolute State is extending its control to the small details of the citizen's life — a tendency which has reached its culmination in the totalitarian States but which is visible even in the democracies. In many countries, as in our own, Catholics constitute only a small minority today just as they did under the early Roman Empire.

Catholics today can repeat the triumphs of their ancestors in the faith, but only at the price of an utter loyalty to their Catholic principles. Not by clever political maneuvers does the Kingdom of God triumph over the mystery of iniquity, not by compromises, not by keeping silent on the doctrine of Christ. The Church triumphs through supernatural means, by charity, by the means of grace, by a ready acceptance of the precious truths revealed to her. "This is the victory that overcomes the world, our faith."[10]

Chapter 4

CHRIST WAS NO CONFORMIST

IF ANY reader still harbors a doubt about the proper attitude of the Christian face to face with the problems of society, his uncertainty can be dispelled by a study of the life of Christ. In this field, as in all others, our Lord's divine example is always and under all circumstances a perfectly safe guide. He Himself, when He presented the Christian life to His hearers, seldom did so by discussing the virtues in the abstract. Instead He again and again called on His disciples and would-be disciples to follow His own example. "Learn from me," He said, or "Come, follow me," or again, "I have given you an example."[1]

The attitude of Christ toward the ills of society is very surprising and remarkable. It is not at all what one would expect if one were to consider His mission from the standpoint of human prudence. Christ became incarnate to save mankind. Part of His mission was to teach those truths which would be the salvation of man and society. For the success of His work it was necessary that those truths should be widely known and widely accepted. One might therefore expect that He would have used every legitimate human means to give His message prestige in the eyes of men. He might have used wealth, social status, and a reputation for learning to attract the favorable attention of the keymen of Palestine. When He had won them over, one might think it would have been an easy matter to persuade the common people.

It is interesting to speculate how Christ would have lived

if He had thus followed the dictates of human prudence. He alone of all men was able to choose the circumstances of His birth. He might then have chosen to be born into a family of well-established but moderate wealth, equally removed from the excessive luxury of the very rich and the penury of the despised poor. Such a family background would have given Him valuable connections. As a child and a youth He would have been able to meet men of affairs and impress them by a grave urbanity. As a young man He could have spent some years studying at Jerusalem, there to impress the rabbis by His youthful wisdom — as indeed He actually did, but only on one brief occasion.[2] Thus He could have gained useful allies among the Scribes and the Pharisees. He might also have spent a year or two at Athens, making friends among young Greek intellectuals, and acquiring a background which would prove impressive later on. Then He could have made the grand tour with proper letters of introduction to leading men at Rome and in the provinces, and so return home ready to begin His public life.

We can imagine what sort of a man Christ would have been with such a background, a man with many friends and few enemies. All would have been won by His affability, His urbanity, His charm. He would have been acceptable to the rich because He came from their own class, yet He would not have excited their jealousy by being excessively rich. The Herodians would have accepted Him for His connections with important people in government circles. The Scribes and Pharisees would view Him favorably as a brilliant former pupil. Thus all would be ready to give His message sympathetic attention. He would be able to win men all the more easily because He could talk to each man in his own language. The Jews would be impressed by His thorough familiarity with the Law and all its most fashionable rabbinical interpretations. To the Hellenists He would use the technical language of current Greek philosophy com-

bined with polished rhetoric. To the Sadducees and the Herodians He would show Himself able to appreciate the viewpoint of the man of the world. After joining with them in discussing business conditions and the latest political gossip, He would gradually turn the conversation to His own message which He would explain to them in the curt, pithy language of the practical businessman. And the poor? The uneducated? Well, after all, would it really be necessary to make any direct appeal to *them?* Once it became known that Christ had chosen as His Apostles twelve men of standing in the community, twelve key men, the poor would fall into line almost as a matter of course.

This hypothetical picture of Christ as He might have been sounds reasonable enough from the standpoint of pure human prudence. It could be justified by much the same arguments as the conformists use. It seems characterized by balance and moderation and common sense. And yet — it is sheer blasphemy! In almost every respect it is as unlike as possible the actual picture of our Blessed Lord as His beloved life is presented to us in the Gospels.

Christ was no conformist! He did not feel it necessary for the success of His mission to make a special appeal to the "outstanding" men of the community. He did not flatter them. He did not speak their language. He did not ape their manner of life. Quite the contrary! He identified Himself with the disfranchised poor and thus antagonized all the privileged classes. The cleavage between the classes in our Lord's Palestine was definite and deep. On the one hand were the leading citizens, the rich, the Scribes, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the Herodians.[3] The Gospel of Christ carried little appeal for such men. "Has any one of the rulers believed in him, or any of the Pharisees?"[4] On the other hand were the multitudes of the dispossessed, peasant farmers earning a precarious livelihood, sharecroppers, slaves and servants, day laborers in agriculture and commerce, the unemployed.[5] The upper classes held

these men in contempt. "This crowd, which does not know the Law, is accursed."[6] To these our Lord made His direct appeal. He was able to boast, "The poor have the gospel preached to them,"[7] and He cites this fact along with His miracles as a proof of His divine mission. But by identifying Himself with the masses Christ earned the undying hatred of the privileged. He took His stand and boldly suffered the consequences.

One must read the Gospels attentively with this special point in mind to realize how deliberately Christ took sides in the class struggle and how directly this attitude of His brought down persecution upon Him. He might have chosen as His mother and foster father people of position. Instead He chose a workingman and a workingman's wife. He might have been born into any degree of luxury He desired. Instead He decided in favor of the stable at Bethlehem. At the very moment of His birth He had already sided with the poor.

Then there were the long years of His hidden life. At first glance it may appear that we do not know much about this period, for the Evangelists have little to say concerning it; but upon further consideration we realize that we know about it all we need to know. One incident is very revealing. When Christ revisited Nazareth during His public life, the townsfolk were astonished to find that He was anything other than one of themselves. "Is not this the carpenter," they said, "the son of Mary?" and again, "Is not this the carpenter's son?"[8] If *we* do not know the details of the hidden life, at least these people did. They had associated with Him, man and boy, for many years. Village life, with its unavoidable intimacy, had familiarized them with all the visible details of His daily routine. And what was their impression? Why, He was just one of themselves, a workingman.

To learn the external details of Christ's hidden life, one has only to examine the life of the working class as it was

then and as it is now; for in spite of the passage of nineteen centuries it remains the same in its essentials. Working people, by and large, are poor — not destitute like beggars and vagabonds, but poor. They eat plain food, they wear shabby clothes, they live in very simple homes, their recreation is limited by their poverty. At least one may be sure that this standard was not exceeded at Nazareth; for it was one of the slum areas of Galilee. "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" asked Nathanael in amazement when he heard where our Lord's home was. Working people, then, live poorly for the most part and they do the hard, monotonous work of the world, toiling and sweating, earning their bread the hard way. For this they receive little credit. The world takes little notice of the simple annals of the poor. Their desires are given scant consideration. It was with this group that Christ identified Himself. He did not choose to belong to the white-collar class. He chose to be the man in overalls.

Such a background should have made our Lord's position in the class struggle clear enough; but, lest there should be any remaining doubt, He chose to clarify His attitude in a very dramatic way at almost the beginning of His public life. He made a scene — in the Temple, of all places, and at the Pasch when all Palestine was flocking thither for the feast! He attacked the merchants selling their oxen, sheep, and doves and the bankers changing money at their tables. If He had limited Himself to words, it would have been bad enough. But He had recourse to physical violence. "Making a kind of whip of cords, he drove them all out of the temple."[9] It is an interesting scene for meditation, the crowd aghast in awed silence at the strange happening, the money rolling across the pavement and trodden underfoot unnoticed, the bleating sheep, the oxen running hither and thither, and all the time the *snap, snap* of the whip as the angry Christ laid it on the backs of the shocked and

indignant businessmen. Doubtless the sensation created spread quickly to the farthest ends of the country.

After that there certainly could be no doubt where our Lord stood, but He was not yet finished with the businessmen. One day He shocked His hearers with the bald statement, "I say to you, it is easier for a camel to pass through an eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven."[10] Even the disciples, St. Matthew tells us, "were exceedingly astonished" as indeed are most Catholics when they hear this passage. In either case the astonishment is altogether understandable. Like the disciples, we ourselves are so accustomed to look upon wealth as a mark of divine election that we are easily shocked by Christ's statement that the very salvation of the wealthy is precarious. Yet our Lord did not modify His declaration except to remind His hearers that all things are possible with the help of God's grace, even, it would seem, the salvation of the rich.[11]

Another class of highly "respectable" citizens antagonized by Christ was the Pharisees and their attendant Scribes. These men prided themselves on their meticulous observance of the Mosaic Law, and it is noteworthy that our Lord did not criticize them for this. He found fault with their conduct rather than with their teaching. "All things, therefore, that they command you, observe and do. But do not act according to their works; for they talk but do nothing."[12] When He did censure their doctrine, it was on the basis of the unauthorized additions which they had made to the Law of Moses. "Letting go the commandment of God, you hold fast the tradition of men, the washing of pots and of cups; and many other things you do like to these."[13]

If Christ's criticism of the doctrine of the Pharisees was measured, His denunciation of their lives was extraordinarily and "brood of vipers." "You traverse sea and land," He emphatic. He called them "hypocrites" and "blind fools" said, "to make one convert; and when he has become one,

you make him twofold more a son of hell than yourselves." He denounced them for not being what they seemed. "Woe to you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because you are like whited sepulchres, which outwardly appear to men beautiful, but within are full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. So you outwardly appear just to men, but within you are full of hypocrisy and iniquity."[14]

The Pharisees were not used to plain language like this. Their position in society was eminently respectable. Living consciously sanctimonious lives, they were accustomed to deference on every hand. The first places in the synagogues were conceded to them as a matter of course. It was the Pharisees who gave their blessing to the class structure of Palestine and thus provided a sort of religious sanction for the domination of the privileged classes. To attack them was more than a personal insult. It was an assault on the whole class system, which was so satisfactory to the leading citizens who reaped benefits from it. When a man of the people begins to attack special privilege, the dominant classes have only one answer — death. The Pharisees did not hesitate long before reaching their decision that this dangerous radical must die.

In this design they found ready allies in the Herodians.[15] These men were allies of the House of Herod, ambitious men anxious for political power. Christ did not attack civil authority, but He was jealous for the rights of Almighty God from whom civil authority itself flows. He claimed the prerogative of interpreting and criticizing the authority of the State. He was bold enough to call a ruler of the House of Herod a "fox,"[16] not a deferential way of referring to a high official of the Empire. A man who talked like this was a threat to the established order of things. He was a dangerous radical. He could not be tolerated. Finally, the Sadducees, who had already been denounced in their turn,[17] were ready enough to join in the death plot along with the Scribes, the Pharisees, the Herodians, and the other enemies

of Christ. By His plain speech and His outspoken criticisms our Lord had already antagonized all the most powerful elements in the population of Palestine.

It is interesting to note the accusations alleged against Christ before Pilate who, as the representative of the Roman Empire, had the power to pronounce the death sentence. The burden of the indictment was: "We have found this man perverting our nation. . . . He is stirring up the people, teaching throughout all Judea, and beginning from Galilee even to this place."[18] This is why Christ was put to death. How frank the accusation was! "He is stirring up the people." To stir up is to agitate and it was as a social agitator that Christ was crucified. Of course this was not the deepest reason for His death. The deepest reason was His own decision to offer up His life for the redemption of mankind. Yet it is significant that the immediate cause which actually brought about the crucifixion was the hatred of the privileged classes for a man who stirred up the masses.

Christ was a social agitator, but He was a social agitator of a very particular sort. He had nothing in common with modern leftist radicals, and the occasional attempt of such people to claim our Lord as one of themselves is both stupid and blasphemous. Christ had no hatred for the privileged classes; He included them in His universal love for all mankind. He did not encourage envy of the rich, but taught that for all men wealth is a matter of minor importance, as His Church has continued to teach after Him. For as Eric Gill has well said, "The Church does not exist to make the poor rich, but the rich poor, and the poor holy."[19] Christ did not want political revolution and on one occasion when His followers wanted to put Him at the head of a revolutionary movement, "he fled again to the mountain, himself alone."[20]

Christ was a social agitator only in that He told the exact truth about society, at all times and in all places, fear-

lessly, publicly, and with dramatic emphasis. He did not flatter the Roman Empire on the one hand, nor Jewish nationalistic aspirations on the other. He did not curry favor with the Pharisees by overlooking their hypocrisy. He did not fawn upon the rich, but told them to worry about their salvation. When He found the businessmen trafficking in the Temple, worldly discretion might have counseled silence; but He knew that His silence could be misinterpreted and so He used a whip to make His attitude plain. He laid the basis for Christian social reform by telling the truth always with perfect clarity and refusing to compromise with error. Therefore He was persecuted and put to death.

At times it is a bit disconcerting to reflect that Christ expects us to do what He did. Yet such is the very essence of the Christian's duty. We can call ourselves Christians, followers of Christ, only to the extent that we dare to imitate Him. Consider carefully what this implies. It means that Catholics must pursue a policy diametrically opposed to that advocated by the conformists. There must be no guilty silences; we must tell the whole truth. By telling the whole truth we shall make it clear that our fundamental doctrine is as different as possible from materialistic teachings. Unimportant and superficial resemblances must not be overemphasized. Our Catholic doctrine, moreover, must be preached not by word only but by deed. This means that we must really value poverty above riches and show it in our actions. It means that we must refuse to cooperate with unbelievers whenever our cooperation might be misinterpreted as approval. In the long run this policy will make Catholics visibly a group apart. It will attract ridicule, ostracism, and, finally, persecution. But it is our plain duty.

It is hard for the conformists to realize that Catholics should be pariahs in a worldly society. This is only human nature. After repeated predictions of the passion, St. Luke

records of the disciples: "They understood none of these things and this saying was hidden from them, neither did they get to know the things that were being said."[21] Human beings can be surprisingly obtuse when unpleasant facts are to be faced. Yet the example of Christ is too clear to be explained away. He was the Son of God; yet He suffered poverty, persecution, and the cross. How do we hope to escape suffering if we call ourselves His followers? Our Lord Himself stated the principle clearly. "No disciple is above his teacher, nor is the servant above his master. It is enough for the disciple to be like his teacher, and for the servant to be like his master. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more those of his household!"[22]

This is reasonable enough, is it not? Suppose a wealthy man should hire a butler and should say to him: "It is my policy to give my servants the same living standard as I allow myself. Your sleeping room shall be an exact duplicate of mine. The same food shall be served to you and to me. Your salary is ample and so you can dress as fashionably as myself." Certainly this would represent extraordinary kindness and consideration. Suppose, then, the prospective servant should reply: "This bedroom indeed is good enough for you; but I demand a better one for myself. I pride myself on being something of an epicure, and I insist that I be served better food than you. My condition in life demands that I be more fashionably dressed than you are." Would not everybody agree that such would be strange language even from the most demanding servant?

The language of the conformist, however, reveals an attitude quite as unreasonable as that of the hypothetical butler. In effect, he says: "My Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, You lived the hard and toilsome life of a workingman at Nazareth; but I, Your follower, demand something better. I want to be accepted as an equal by the privileged classes. You created a scene in the Temple and brought down odium

upon Yourself; but I shall do nothing sensational, nothing that will make people ridicule me. Because You dared to tell the truth, men hated You and spat upon You. I, however, shall maintain a prudent reserve about ticklish issues. After all, it would be beneath my dignity to have men spit on me!" What kind of language would that be on the lips of a follower of Christ? And if conformists do not put it thus into words, does not this language express their attitude? Argue as we may, we cannot sidestep the facts. If we are to imitate Christ, we must imitate Him in His social action and suffer the same sort of persecution as He suffered.

Catholic conformists can render themselves more or less acceptable to unbelieving social thinkers and publicists by maintaining a disingenuous silence about the mystery of iniquity and the whole supernatural aspect of the Church's social doctrine. But suppose they — and all of us — should be perfectly frank and outspoken about Catholic social teaching. Suppose we should talk more about hell. Injustice and immorality and hatred are not just "hindrances and obstructions to human values"; they are the road to hell. Hell is no joke; it is a grim reality. On the other hand, the fact of the Mystical Body is a fact in just as real a sense as a population curve or an immigration law — and it is infinitely more important. Suppose we should consistently talk about these things and weave them into our sociology; what would happen then? Why, then of course we should be ridiculed. We should lose our standing completely among the "social scientists." But we would be right!

If we want to keep our reputation for sanity and common sense, we would do well to join in the usual American persecution of the Negro. A good conformist, of course, would not overdo it. Indeed, by issuing carefully worded statements and passing resolutions it is possible to get a reputation for being "forward-looking" men. Statements and resolutions have a pleasant sound and they constitute no real

threat to white supremacy. But suppose we should begin to take Catholic doctrine at its face value. Suppose we should treat Negroes as though we really took seriously the doctrine of the Mystical Body. Suppose we showed our contempt for the nasty doctrine of white supremacy in sensational, dramatic ways? What would be the answer to that? A lynch mob, possibly. A noose at the end of a rope. Martyrdom for a Catholic doctrine perhaps. Not an alluring prospect to flesh and blood. But we would be right!

We meet in a first-class hotel and discuss the problems of poverty. The silver is well-polished, the linen is snowy, the cuisine is excellent. Then we settle back in our chairs and listen to the annual report. Trained, professional social workers. A well-balanced budget. The latest modern techniques. Fine phrases. And at the same hour little hungry children steal through dark alleys, searching for food in the garbage cans, and curse us as hypocrites under their breath. Suppose we should forget everything but Christ. Christ knew poverty, not from the annual report, but from harsh experience. Christ loved the poor enough to be one of them. Suppose we dared to be real followers of Him and do the same thing, a brave, rash thing. There is excellent advice in the Gospel of St. Matthew, chapter nineteen, verse twenty-one: "If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow Me."

Exaggerated nationalism is quite characteristic of the Catholic conformists. Only they do not call it exaggerated nationalism; they call it patriotism, applying an honorable name to a nasty thing. One can make a name for oneself as a respectable, reliable citizen by echoing all the nationalistic catch phrases, down to that most dishonorable of all, "My country right or wrong." And all the while a calm, dignified voice sounds from the Vatican Hill. The speaker is a man, Eugenio Pacelli, but the voice is the voice of

Jesus Christ. Suppose we should heed that voice. Suppose we should proclaim to our fellow citizens the doctrine which that voice is teaching, a doctrine at once so unflattering, so dangerous, and so true. Bluntly and forthrightly we should state that the love we owe our country is a limited love, limited by the infinitely more important love of God. Our first duty is to Him; our country stands in second place. In this sense we are Catholics first and Americans afterwards, and very proud to own it. Suppose we should talk like that. The smiles on our neighbors' faces would soon turn to scowls. We would be the butt of insults. We would be ostracized. This much at least — and perhaps more. Perhaps mob violence, burned churches, murdered priests. But we would be right.

Be honest. Is there any other way? Is there any other way to be a follower of Christ except to take up His cross? He said there was no alternative; shall we dare to differ with Him? No, there is no other way, no other road to real social reform in a Catholic sense save the rough road which our Lord explored for us. Only by following in His footsteps can we save the world. All else is vain and empty and foolish. If we are Catholics, we must follow Christ. If we follow Christ, we must antagonize the world and suffer the consequences. It is all as simple as that!

Chapter 5

CONFORMIST SOCIOLOGY

ONE'S attitude toward specific social problems and other social issues will necessarily be colored by one's conception of society in general, its nature and its functioning. A Marxist is dominated by one theory; a Fascist, by another; a liberal, by yet another. Each has his preconceptions; and according as these preconceptions are further from, or nearer to, objective reality, so will the social action of each be unwholesome or sound. The Catholic also must have a realistic view of the nature of society, or else he will merely be beating the air when he attacks the evils of society.

The branch of knowledge which deals with society in a broad way is called sociology. The attempt to frame a definition of this discipline which shall be acceptable to all schools of thought usually leads to hair-splitting and endless logomachy. For the present purpose a common-sense definition will be sufficient. Let us therefore define sociology as the study of society. While other social sciences, economics, for example, or politics or history, study particular aspects of society and particular varieties of social phenomena, sociology studies society in its most general aspects and attempts to arrive at broad generalizations which will apply to all human group activities. Evidently the subject has a considerable importance for those who deal with social issues. For even the man who has had no formal training in sociology will obviously have some attitudes and preconceptions of a sociological nature. There is an advantage

in bringing these preconceptions before the mind consciously, making them explicit, and examining them systematically. It is here that sociology can be of service.

Auguste Comte (1798–1857) is generally recognized as the founder of sociology in the modern sense. At least it is certain that he introduced the term itself. Comte's thought has had an enormous influence on later generations of sociologists. For our present purpose there is one theory of his that deserves particular attention, the so-called *law of the three states*. This occupied a key position in his system and has had an important effect on sociology ever since. According to the theory, each branch of human knowledge passes historically through three evolutionary phases. In the first phase, the theological, men suppose "all phenomena to be produced by the immediate action of supernatural beings." The second phase is the metaphysical, in which "the mind supposes, instead of supernatural beings, abstract forces, veritable entities (that is, personified abstractions) inherent in all beings, and capable of producing all phenomena." Finally comes the positivistic phase, wherein "the mind has given over the vain search after Absolute notions, the origin and destination of the universe, and the causes of phenomena." As a result, "what is now understood when we speak of an explanation of facts is simply the establishment of a connection between single phenomena and some general facts, the number of which continually diminishes with the progress of science."[1]

Comte was much impressed by the progress of natural science. Physics and chemistry, for example, were building up a body of proved and undebatable facts. To his mind the flourishing state of these sciences formed a striking contrast to the condition of the social sciences in which all seemed to be uncertainty. Why should not the social sciences profit by the same methods which had proved so brilliantly successful in physics and chemistry? In Comte's own words: "The theological and metaphysical philosophies

have failed to secure permanent social welfare, while the positive philosophy has uniformly succeeded, and conspicuously for three centuries past, in reorganizing, to the unanimous satisfaction of the intellectual world, all the anterior orders of human conceptions, which had been till then in the same chaotic state that we now deplore, in regard to social science. Contemporary opinion regarded the state of each of those sciences as hopeless till the positive philosophy brought them out of it. There is no reason why it should fail in the latest application, after having succeeded in all the earlier."[2] It was therefore to the "positive philosophy," that is, the scientific method as interpreted by himself, that Comte looked for the salvation of social science.

Comte's viewpoint has been discussed at some length because it is so important for the understanding of modern sociology. Historically the former has indeed been the background of the latter. Contemporary sociologists, for the most part, are the intellectual children of Comte. Especially is this true in the United States. There are occasional protests, but, by and large, American sociologists believe that social phenomena are not essentially different from chemical and physical phenomena and that therefore they should be studied scientifically by much the same methods. The sociologist, like the physicist, has certain facts before him which he must observe, measure, and record as accurately as possible. The data thus acquired are to be analyzed, preferably by mathematical methods. In this way certain generalizations, certain "laws," are to be discovered and these will be quite parallel to the laws of physics. There is nothing unique about human actions which would make them an exception among other natural phenomena. This is the usual viewpoint of American sociology.[3] Since this viewpoint is essentially that of Comte, it seems fair to refer to these writers as "positivist sociologists."

It cannot be denied that here and there sociology has

profited from the example of the exact sciences. Sociologists can, for example, use mathematical methods in analyzing the trend of birth rates, death rates, and the like, and these methods are not altogether unlike those used by the physicist. Again, the example of physical science has taught the sociologist to be more painstaking and precise in collecting data; and this has led to a wholesome reaction against the careless theorizing so characteristic of the older sociology. It remains true, however, that scientific method, as interpreted and applied to the study of society by the positivist school, has given current sociology a fundamentally wrong orientation.

It is a basic error to assume, as contemporary sociologists usually do, that there is no essential difference between the types of facts studied by sociology and physics respectively and that, therefore, the same general scientific methods may be used in either case without essential modification. To begin with, this assumption leaves free will out of account — indeed the dogma of determinism is a basic postulate among contemporary sociologists. Behavioristic psychology has taught them to overlook or deny the influence of intelligence and free will in the study of human conduct. Lundberg is merely expressing the opinion of the group when he says, "Fortunately, the behavioristic approach in psychology is rapidly relegating these quaint metaphysical survivals to the limbo of scientific discussion."[4]

Secondly, the methods of the positivist sociologists leave morality out of account. In this respect the influence of the physical sciences has been pernicious. Physics studies "the properties and phenomena of inanimate matter as affected by forces."[5] It is quite logical that the physicist should not be concerned with the morality of his data; for matter and force have no morality. But the sociologist deals with human acts which have morality as one of their properties. A falling body is neither morally good nor morally bad. A scientist may study the laws of falling bodies exhaustively

and be quite justified in leaving moral considerations out of account. But a sociologist sets himself a queer task when he decides to study murder as a social phenomenon without committing himself to the proposition that murder is immoral and should be eliminated. Such a study may be possible, but it is hardly very profitable.

Finally, human acts have their inevitable supernatural aspect which the positivist sociologists leave out of account. Indeed, they often deny the very existence of the supernatural — emphatically and sometimes rather irately. Yet the Catholic knows that the relation of a human act to man's supernatural end is its most important quality. To deny the supernatural is to deny the most important order of facts which pertain to society. A theory of society which neglects the supernatural is necessarily partial and unrealistic.

It is easy enough to understand why the average contemporary sociologist chooses to study human social activities by positivist methods. These methods were developed by men tenaciously convinced that there is no free will, that the supernatural is a myth, and that there is no absolute standard of morality. Since the sociologists we are discussing hold these same dogmas with unshakable conviction, positivist methods exactly suit them. Their prejudices being what they are, any other methods would be illogical for them. Positivist methods are completely appropriate to the modern world. For the world is confused to a tragic degree concerning the most elementary principles of morality. The world has rejected Christ. Its denizens cry out like the men in the parable, "We do not wish this man to be king over us."[6] The world is permeated by the mystery of iniquity.

It is less easy to understand why Catholics of the conformist variety choose to ape the methods of the positivist school. It is true enough that there are many isolated phenomena which the Catholic and the positivist may each

study by the same scientific methods. Such, for example, are population trends, the distribution of delinquency in urban areas, or the existing differences between white and Negro housing. It is not surprising that the methodology of Catholics and atheists should overlap here and there. Even so, a Catholic biblical scholar and an unbeliever will be likely to use precisely the same methods to determine the date of a Greek uncial. What is surprising is that some Catholics should be ready to accept from positivists the whole methodology of a science like sociology which deals with human acts.

Of course, the conformists have an explanation for their attitude — though it is not a very convincing one. They argue that there can be no objection against the use of natural reason for the study of social phenomena. The methods which they take over from the positivists are nothing more or less than such a use of natural reason. Therefore the use of such methods is unobjectionable. This argument is obviously sound as far as it goes; but what, after all, does it prove? It merely proves what was stated in the last paragraph, namely, that the methods appropriate to Catholics and positivists overlap at certain points. These points are to be found when certain aspects of social phenomena are abstracted from their background and studied in isolation. For example, a Catholic sociologist and a positivist might fittingly use the same methods in preparing a spot map showing the location of all the poolrooms in Chicago. Here one aspect of a social phenomenon is isolated, namely, geographical location. On this point there is no reason for disagreement between believers and unbelievers.

If all sociology consisted of isolated points of this sort, then the conformist argument would prove that there is no reason why Catholic sociology and positivistic sociology should not be one and the same thing. Even so, Catholic and rationalistic biblical science would be one and the same thing if scripture scholars did nothing but try to date

Greek uncials. The supposition, however, is contrary to fact. There are whole areas of sociology — and these the most important ones — in which Catholics and materialists cannot possibly agree. Consider, for example, the whole field of social problems. It has already been pointed out in the first chapter that it is not even possible to define a social problem without some sort of a criterion to distinguish between the desirable and the undesirable, in other words, without some sort of an ethical standard. The positivist, who insists on studying society by the methods of the physical sciences, cannot consistently invoke an ethical standard, for physics knows no morality. Neither can a Catholic, if he imitates positivist sociology in a perfectly logical manner.

It is not merely in the area of social problems that positivist methods must logically be unacceptable to the Catholic. Sociology constantly deals with human acts. It seeks to explain those human acts which fall within its scope, why they happened and under what conditions they are likely to be repeated. In explaining human acts Catholics must constantly take into account two factors which the positivists entirely reject, namely, free will and grace. How can the same methods be appropriate both for those who accept these factors and for those who reject them? Take one example. The Catholic Church is itself a social phenomenon and therefore an appropriate subject for sociological study. Catholics hold that the origin and the continued existence of the Church are due to the will of God operating in supernatural and often miraculous ways. To the positivist that is utter nonsense. He insists on explaining the Church, like all other social phenomena, by purely natural causes. How, then, could two sociologists, one a Catholic and one a positivist, agree on the appropriate methods to be used for a sociological study of the Church?

There is an argument frequently used by the conformists in an attempt to answer these criticisms of their position. We admit, they say in effect, that for the Catholic no study

of society is complete unless the data of philosophy (ethics particularly) and of theology are taken into account. But there should be a division of labor. The Catholic sociologist should study society by the methods of natural science, which are indeed the same methods used by the positivists. But the data of such studies must be supplemented by the work of two other types of scholars, namely, philosophers and theologians. Admittedly, sociology as we understand it gives an incomplete view of society even in the hands of a Catholic; but it is true as far as it goes. When this view has been completed by the proper philosophical and theological additions, it is satisfactory to the most orthodox. So the conformists argue.

The weakness of this argument is psychological rather than theological. It leaves out of account the inevitable effect of such a proposal upon the student. Consider a concrete instance. A Catholic sociologist of the conformist variety gives an undergraduate course on the family. Faithful to his principle, he considers his subject purely from the standpoint of natural science. Negatively, his course differs from one that an unbelieving sociologist might give in a state university — he neither advocates contraception nor divorce. But positively the two types of courses are much alike. The Catholic teacher, like his state university colleague, discusses the family on a purely naturalistic ground. He has a great deal to say about the physical side of marriage. He discusses sex education. Though he does not advocate contraception, he talks much of the "rhythm." He treats of premarital clinics. He discourses on eugenics. He tells his students what psychiatrists have to say about marriage problems. Never a word about marriage as a sacrament. Never a word about the effect of divine grace.

Ask anyone who knows the undergraduate mind what the effect of such a course on the students will be. The answer should be plain enough. For class after class during a whole semester the students have heard marriage discussed from

a purely natural standpoint. They look on their teacher with respect. They feel they can trust him, for he holds his appointment from the priests or nuns who run the college. For a semester they have been systematically indoctrinated in a view of the family which does not indeed contradict Catholic teaching positively at any point but which most certainly does not represent the Church's view of marriage and the family as expounded, for example, in Pope Pius XI's encyclical *Casti connubii*. It is a rare undergraduate who has so thoroughly critical a mind and so sound a grasp of the Church's doctrine that he will come out of such a course unharmed.

It is a poor excuse to plead that the religion teacher will supplement such a course by adding to it the appropriate Catholic teaching on the family and Christian marriage. It is poor pedagogy to ask one teacher to spend his time removing the misconceptions for which another teacher is responsible. No teacher should give a biased view of his subject to his students. There is reason to be ashamed of a Catholic college if any of its teachers, in treating a subject on which the Church has spoken, omits entirely all reference to Catholic doctrine.

Merely by silence a teacher can give his students a certain definite impression. This occurs whenever the nature of the course and the circumstances make the students expect something to be said — and it is not said. The omission becomes conspicuous. A professor in Hitler's Germany who would discuss social science for a semester without once praising Nazism would make himself noticeable for his silence. Probably people would say that he was doing a very brave thing by implying his disapproval of the government. Probably he would suffer the consequences. On the other hand, a Catholic physicist who would give a course in his field without mentioning the dogma of creation would hardly cause comment. It is true that he deals with matter. It is true that matter was created. But physi-

cists are not ordinarily concerned with the ultimate origin of matter. It is not usually discussed in the textbooks. Unbelieving physicists do not ordinarily take occasion from their subject matter to ridicule the Church. Therefore when the Catholic also remains silent on the subject of creation, no one is surprised.

In teaching sociology, however, or in writing about sociology, one treats of human acts and the discussion of human acts leads naturally to questions of religion and philosophy. Again and again positivist sociologists betray their attitude on these matters in their works. Their books are full of gibes at the Church, affirmations of determinism, and immoral propositions. They assert that sociology should be "a purely empirical science," but the very arguments they use to justify this are drawn from positivism and positivism is a philosophic system. Certainly a Catholic sociologist who would actually treat his subject as a purely empirical science would make himself rather conspicuous. His silences would be positively clamorous.

One final conformist argument deserves mention. It is based on the fact that distinct sciences have distinct subject matter and methods. A botanist does not discuss the motions of the planets; nor an astronomer, the taxonomy of roses. If, contend the conformists, a Catholic sociologist should discuss the ethical or religious aspects of society, he would "break down the distinction between the sciences." The conformist's sudden concern for the distinction between the sciences is really quite amusing. What is so sacrosanct about these distinctions, after all? Scientists violate them every day with a perfectly clear conscience. It is true that astronomers are not likely to wander into botany but they constantly wander into mathematics and physics, and no one is in the least shocked. Ordinarily the sociologist enjoys a similar liberty. He may borrow facts and methods from economics, anthropology, mathematics, medicine, law, history, geography, and a dozen other fields,

and no one thinks of raising his voice in protest. But once let the sociologist borrow one tiny principle from the science of ethics, and the protest is deafening. The conformist suddenly wakes from his lethargy and accuses his colleague of breaking down the distinction between the sciences. It is illogical enough to be funny.

The relation of sociology to the other sciences needs to be understood clearly. It is certain that in order to get a well-rounded conception of human society one must take into account: first of all, certain revealed truths; secondly, certain truths discovered by philosophy; and thirdly, certain truths acquired by observation and experience. The science which deals with revealed truths, systematizes them, and expounds them accurately is theology. Philosophical truths are, of course, dealt with by philosophy. Sociology itself discusses those truths of observation and experience which are necessary to the understanding of society.

On a superficial view this statement looks like the conformist position. But another factor has to be taken into account, namely, the necessary borrowing by one science of the data which belong primarily to another. For example, a sociologist quite properly discusses the problems of poverty. Poverty obviously has an economic background. The sociologist, as a sociologist, is not competent to judge the purely economic aspects of the problem, so he goes to another expert, the economist, for his data. Poverty also has a medical aspect; the sociologist goes to a medical man for the necessary information. Perhaps it may be found desirable to make a more or less elaborate statistical analysis of certain conditions among the poor. If so, then the aid of the mathematician must be invoked, for mathematical statistics can become highly technical in some of its applications.

Naturally each science has its distinctive features — there is a real distinction between all the sciences. But if this distinction should be unreasonably emphasized, if each

science were isolated from every other and kept in an air-tight compartment, then all serious scholarly work would become practically impossible. The various sciences must be free to borrow from one another. Everyone admits that sociology may borrow from economics or anthropology when the nature of the case demands it. What reason is there why sociology should not also borrow from philosophy and theology whenever such borrowing would be helpful? There is no reason really, except the narrow-minded prejudices of positivists who refuse to recognize the claims of philosophy and revealed religion — even at the expense of consistency. Their prejudice is understandable in view of their background; but surely it is strange that some Catholics should be found to agree with them.

If a sociologist borrows certain principles from ethics, this does not mean that the distinction between sociology and ethics has been broken down. The discovery and precise formulation of these principles belong exclusively to ethics. If a sociologist should endeavor to discover a new ethical principle, or a new argument to demonstrate an old one, then he really would be invading the field of ethics. He would not be doing anything heinous, but he would certainly be out of his own field.

Unless sociology borrows from ethics, certain questions cannot be adequately answered. Suppose someone asks whether the current segregation of the American Negro is morally wrong. Who can answer this question? The ethicist can lay down general principles. He can state that under such and such conditions human rights would be violated. But he cannot, as an ethicist, determine whether these conditions are being realized here and now; for ethics deals exclusively with hypothetical cases. To determine how segregation actually operates in the United States today the aid of the sociologist must be invoked. He makes field studies, he analyzes statistics, he applies a dozen technical methods which the ethicist has not been trained to use. Then

he gives his answer. Thus two distinct sciences cooperate to answer one question. In treating their own peculiar subjects, both the sociologist and the ethicist have the right to quote from each other. The same principle of cooperation and free interchange of data between different branches of knowledge applies also to the relation of sociology and theology. The Catholic student of society must take into consideration, among other things, the facts of revelation.

Does it follow that one is justified in speaking of a "Catholic sociology"? The question seems to be answered clearly in the affirmative in the papal documents. This answer is naturally very unacceptable to the Catholic conformists because it destroys their whole contention that sociology is purely an empirical science and should consequently have the same meaning for both the Catholic and the unbeliever. However, the official statements of the Holy See seem to be too clear to be explained away.

First of all, there is the well-known passage in *Quadragesimo anno* in which Pope Pius XI speaks with commendation of the development of *vera quaedam disciplina socialis catholica.* The usual translation of this phrase is *a truly Catholic social science,* but it could equally well be construed *a truly Catholic sociology.* The two renderings are equivalent in any case; for in the singular the term *social science* is often used interchangeably with *sociology,* though, of course, the plural phrase, *the social sciences,* has a much more inclusive meaning.[7] It is interesting to note in this connection that the *Civiltà Cattolica,* which is usually very well informed on Vatican matters, translates the words in question as *una vera sociologia cattolica.*[8] In any case, *disciplina socialis* cannot be an inclusive term referring to the social sciences in general, for in the preceding paragraph of the encyclical it is contrasted with economics (*socialem et oeconomicam disciplinam*). The social sciences in general include economics, but sociology is distinct from and co-ordinate with that branch. Father

Husslein would seem to be obviously correct when he remarks that Pope Pius has given an authoritative answer to the question "whether we have a right to speak of a 'Catholic social science,' a 'Catholic sociology,' "[9] Nell-Breuning points out in his commentary that the adjective *Catholic* is not applied by the Pope to economics and that, therefore, we are not justified in speaking of a Catholic economics while on the other hand "we are quite justified in speaking of a Catholic social science."[10]

Latin papal documents are written in a rather meticulous classical style. Since there is naturally no classical Latin word for *sociology,* Pope Pius had to use some equivalent phrase. *Disciplina socialis* is probably about as near as one can come to *sociology* if one employs only words in good usage among the ancient authors. This difficulty is removed when papal documents are composed in some modern language. It is therefore interesting to note the letter written in Spanish by Cardinal Merry del Val expressing the thanks of Pope Pius X at receiving copies of Llovera's *Elementary Treatise on Christian Sociology* ("Tratado elemental de Sociologia Cristiana"). So far from expressing any surprise that a book should be written on specifically Christian sociology, the Cardinal praises it for its "purity of doctrine" which he speaks of as an "essential condition."[11] Purity of doctrine would not be an essential condition for a good book on physics or any other purely empirical science. Doctrinal matters are irrelevant to such treatises. But purity of doctrine *is* an essential condition for a book on Christian sociology precisely because sociology is not a purely empirical science. Such seems to be the mind of the Holy See.

Also very significant is a document issued by the Sacred Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, written in Italian and containing the following sentence, "rightly can Holy Church boast of having always been the patroness of all those sociological studies (*tutti quegli studi di sociologia*) which some wish to present in the light of a new

discovery."[12] According to this important statement sociology is no "new discovery," but a branch of learning which the Church has "always" patronized. Down through the centuries Catholic scholars have always studied society. In doing so they have made use of whatever facts observation and experience could yield, but they studied these facts in the light of principles accepted from philosophy and theology. In recent years new methods have been developed for gathering empirical data about society. The Catholic sociologist should take full advantage of these methods, yet in its essentials his science remains what it was in the days of St. Thomas. In this sense sociology is a branch of learning which the Church has always fostered.

To bring out more clearly the essential nature of Catholic sociology, it is worth while to contrast it with two misconceptions which unfortunately have had some influence among Catholics. The first misconception is that of the conformists who set themselves the strange program of making sociology a *purely* empirical science, that is, of studying society without any reference to the truths of philosophy and revelation. This is very certainly a mistake. Sociology, dealing as it does with human activities, cannot afford to neglect such truths.[13]

The second misconception consists in underemphasizing the empirical side of the science, thereby making sociology practically identical with social philosophy. This, too, is a mistake; for sociology must be concerned with concrete social conditions, whereas social philosophy studies society in the abstract and is concerned with general principles. I have before me on my desk, as I write, a book entitled *Catholic Sociology*. It is a useful, well-written volume which expounds in elementary fashion the Catholic philosophy of society — but it is certainly not what the title implies. Its contents are not Catholic sociology.

In contrast to these misconceptions, Catholic sociology, properly conceived, is the study of human society by the

method of observation and experience in the light of principles accepted from philosophy and theology. Because it gives due weight to these principles, it contrasts with conformist sociology. Because it also emphasizes empirical methods, it differs from social philosophy. Although the Catholic sociologist uses two sorts of data, namely, postulates from philosophy and theology and data derived from observation and experience, it is important to note that his relation to these two orders of truths is different. He accepts the postulates; he does not attempt to prove them, but merely uses them in his interpretations. On the other hand, when he deals with empirical data he is in his own element. These are facts which he discovers for himself. Since this is the case, it is fair to say that sociology is an empirical science. But since Catholic sociology does not disregard philosophical and theological truth, it is also fair to add that it is not a *purely* empirical science in the sense of the materialists.

Catholic sociology, thus validly conceived, is an inspiring challenge to the scholar. He must familiarize himself with the very best modern methods. He must learn to apply them with expert ease. He must welcome every sound contribution which his positivist colleagues make in their restricted field. But when he has done these things, his task is by no means finished. The Catholic sociologist must tap the riches of Catholic doctrinal tradition. He must go to the Holy Scriptures, the Fathers, the great Scholastic theologians, the social encyclicals of recent Popes, and familiarize himself with the philosophical and theological postulates which he needs in his work of interpretation. In this complicated task he needs courage, skill, and balanced judgment. He must strive constantly with the chief end in view "that the ever unchanged and unchangeable doctrine of the Church may be applied the more efficaciously to modern needs."[14] Thus he will lay a broad and secure intellectual foundation for the struggle against the mystery of iniquity.

Chapter 6

THE MAMMON OF WICKEDNESS

ONE day our Lord told His hearers that they would have to make a definite choice between the service of God and the service of wealth. "You cannot serve God and mammon."[1] It is easy to understand why this choice is necessary and unavoidable. The pursuit of wealth is a very demanding occupation. It tends to claim all a man's energies and dictate all his choices. Those who love money must live a certain particular sort of life or else they will be unsuccessful in their quest. Wealth has its own ethics which is not altogether consistent with the ethics of the Christian life. Therefore, since "no servant can serve two masters,"[2] every man must choose between money and God.

It is important to realize why our Lord was so severe in condemning the pursuit of wealth. It was not because money is an evil in itself. Nothing in the Holy Scriptures suggests this. Material possessions, like all God's creatures, are in themselves good. But riches have a fascination which easily becomes overpowering and distracts one from more important things. It is a question of psychology. Unless it is carefully watched, a reasonable and prudent concern for the necessities of life gradually grows into oversolicitude and then into a dominating passion which leaves its slave no time for reflection on eternal truth. "The care of this world and the deceitfulness of riches choke the word, and it is made fruitless."[3]

The New Testament writers have much to say about the

love of money and its corrupting influence. It causes, first of all, a false perspective. The rich man is likely to attach too much importance to money. In the Apocalypse the wealthy merchants grieve over the fall of Babylon, not because the city's inhabitants suffer, but because "in one hour riches so great were laid waste."[4] The mariners lament the destruction of a city "wherein all were made rich who had their ships at sea."[5] The rich young man valued his wealth more than the following of Christ.[6] "Covetousness," says St. Paul, "is the root of all evils, and some in their eagerness to get rich have strayed from the faith and have involved themselves in many troubles."[7]

Since the wealthy are likely to overrate the importance of money and since they themselves possess much money, it follows that they tend to have an inflated idea of their own importance. The self-importance of the moneyed man is familiar enough and it is remarked by the New Testament writers. St. Paul counsels Timothy to "charge the rich of this world not to be proud."[8] St. James tries to teach the rich man humility from the impermanence of his state.[9] The same Apostle is shocked at the concessions which even Christians make to the pride of the rich members of the congregation.[10]

The overvaluation of money leads to a parallel overemphasis on the things that money can buy. The rich are likely to give themselves over to a luxurious and sensual mode of life. In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, the former shows this characteristic of his class. It was he "who used to clothe himself in purple and fine linen, and who feasted every day in splendid fashion."[11] The rich fool's philosophy of life was as simple as it was self-indulgent. "Take thy ease, eat, drink, be merry."[12] "You are now having your comfort,"[13] remarked Christ as He pronounced a woe over the rich. This absorption in temporal things easily leads to forgetfulness of death and eternity. The rich fool was planning a life of enjoyment "for many

years."[14] There was bitter irony in the fact that he died that very night. St. James reflects on the tendency among the businessmen of his day to lay their plans with no regard for the inevitable fact of death. "Behold now, you who say, 'Today or tomorrow we will go into such a city, and spend a year there, and trade and make money'; you who do not know what will happen tomorrow."[15]

If the effect of wealth were merely to corrupt an isolated individual here and there, then it might be a serious problem in ascetical theology but it would not be a serious problem socially. As a matter of fact, however, its tendency is to infect an entire class and through that class to exert a pernicious influence on the whole of society. This aspect of the question is very noticeable in the New Testament. The attentive reader will notice that individual rich men are not criticized as isolated exceptions within their group but rather that the whole class of rich men are lumped together in a general condemnation. Of course there are exceptions. Zacchaeus and Joseph of Arimathea — both specifically called "rich" — appear in a favorable light. But by and large the condemnation of the class holds good.

It is obviously important to determine, as accurately as possible, the nature of this class of rich men which is censured as a whole; for only thus can the New Testament thought on wealth be accurately understood. It is important to note, first of all, that the Greek word πλούσιος used in the text of the New Testament does not correspond precisely to the English word "rich." According to the Greek conception, society was divided into two economic classes, the πλούσιοι and the πένητες.[16] This is a different viewpoint from our own; for we are used to thinking of society as divided into three classes, the rich, the poor, and a large intermediate class which is neither rich nor poor. The Greek division was twofold; ours is threefold. Another difference lies in the very principle of classification itself. We classify men as "rich" on the basis of the amount of money they

possess. The Greeks took into account the way the money was acquired. A πλούσιος was a man who was able to support himself by operating with his capital without routine labor and especially without manual labor. A man who worked with his hands, even a gifted sculptor or a skilled surgeon, was considered an artisan, along with the carpenter and the mason.

Modern research has thrown a good deal of light on the activities of the πλούσιοι of the first century.[17] They were typically commercial farmers, *rentiers,* merchants engaged in interregional commerce, or bankers who profited from loans and the operations of international exchange. Perhaps the nearest modern equivalent for the Greek term is *bourgeoisie.* The New Testament censures, not so much the class which possesses wealth, as rather the bourgeoisie, the class actively engaged in the pursuit of wealth. Merely to be the possessor of considerable means is not necessarily demoralizing. A man may inherit wealth, use it generously and unselfishly, and not be unreasonably attached to it. But it is hard to remain detached from money when one is actively devoted to the quest of gain as the members of the bourgeoisie are, almost by definition. This may explain why there have been a number of canonized saints who were "rich" in the English sense of the term — St. Louis IX of France, for example — while there have been few bourgeois saints who spent their time making money by business operations. The bourgeois life does not conduce to holiness.

It is easy to see why the life of the bourgeoisie as a class has an evil influence on society. The bad example of an isolated avaricious man may not be very destructive, but the bad example of a whole class devoted to the frenzied pursuit of wealth is likely to infect all classes of society. When this occurs the common purpose of a whole people can become colored by avarice. Economic life degenerates into a merciless struggle for gain. As the cruel competition

progresses, the rich become richer and the poor become poorer. For the economic resources available in a given time and place are not unlimited in amount; if one receives more than his fair share, another must receive less. The rich man's gain is the poor man's loss. As the contrast between the classes becomes more pronounced, not only wealth but power as well is concentrated in the hands of the wealthy. Questions of policy are settled from the standpoint of upper-class selfishness and not from the standpoint of justice and right. Dollar diplomacy makes its appearance, and wars are fought to gain new sources of raw materials or new outlets for exports. Society is dominated by a mean philosophy of selfishness.

St. Thomas Aquinas is very vivid in his description of the corruption of civic life through the spread of the bourgeois spirit. "If the citizens themselves are devoted to commercial pursuits, the way is opened to many vices. For, since businessmen are concerned above all about making a profit from their dealings, avarice infects the hearts of the citizens. As a result everything in the city will have its price. Mutual confidence is destroyed and corruption appears on the scene. Everyone will seek his own profit without concern for the public welfare. The cultivation of virtue will wane; for honor, which should be virtue's reward, will be open to anybody. Necessarily, therefore, will the common life of such a city be corrupted."[18] This is strong language, but St. Thomas is not given to exaggeration!

The divine judgment on the evil of a selfish bourgeois class is very clear in the Sacred Scriptures. It will be sufficient to consider three instances, although examples could easily be multiplied. Consider, then, first the Kingdom of Israel in the middle years of the eighth century before Christ. Jeroboam II was on the throne and Damascus, Israel's traditional enemy, had been humbled. Material prosperity had come hand in hand with military success. Commerce flourished; wealth increased. The privileged classes gave

themselves over to luxurious living, while the poor languished in misery. Under these circumstances a strange, gaunt figure appeared on the streets of Samaria, the capital. It was Amos, not a professional prophet but a plain man, a herdsman and a gatherer of sycamore fruit.[19] He came from Thecua, a sad and lonely place a few miles south of Bethlehem, to pronounce the doom of Israel.

Amos attacked the businessmen who were so eager in the unjust pursuit of wealth that they resented the necessity of closing their stores even on religious holidays. "Hear this," he cried, "you that crush the poor and make the needy of the land to fail, saying, 'When will the new moon be gone that we may sell grain, and the sabbath that we may set forth wheat, that we may lessen the measure and increase the sickle and convey in deceitful balances, that we may possess the needy for money, and the poor for a pair of shoes, and may sell the refuse of the wheat?' "[20] Instead of using their power for the benefit of the common people, the privileged classes had abused their prerogatives. Corruption was rife in the law courts. "You have turned judgment into bitterness, and the fruit of justice into wormwood."[21] In burning words Amos contrasted the luxurious life of the rich with their indifference toward the suffering of the poor. "They sleep upon beds of ivory and are wanton on their couches. They eat the lambs out of the flock and the calves out of the midst of the stall. They sing to the sound of the psaltery; like David, they have invented instruments of music! They drink wine in bowls and anoint themselves with the best ointments — and they are not concerned with the affliction of Joseph."[22]

God, however, cannot be mocked indefinitely. The selfish rich shall not continue to enjoy their ill-gotten gains. "Because you trample upon the poor and take from him exactions of wheat, you have built houses of hewn stone but you shall not dwell in them, you have planted delightful vineyards but you shall not drink the wine of them."[23]

Instead of enjoying their anticipated ease, the members of the guilty dominant class are to suffer a horrible fate. "The Lord God hath sworn by His own soul, saith the Lord, the God of hosts. I detest the pride of Jacob and I hate his houses and I will deliver up the city and the inhabitants thereof and it shall come to pass that if there remain ten men in one house, they shall die."[24] The punishment of Israel will form an ironic contrast to the present insouciance. "I will turn your feasts into mourning and your songs into lamentation, and I will bring up sackcloth upon all loins and baldness upon every head, and I will make it as the mourning of an only son and the latter end thereof as a bitter day."[25] It was not long before the dire prophecies of Amos were fulfilled. In 722 B.C. Samaria fell before the Assyrian hosts, a bitter example for all the world to contemplate.

A second illustration of the divine judgment on privilege abused is furnished by the Kingdom of Judah, Israel's neighbor to the south. Even before the fall of Samaria the integrity of Judah was being sapped by the same evils. The rich gave themselves up to luxury while the poor suffered. Against these evils the prophet Isaias raised his voice. He was himself a member of the educated classes, to judge from his fluent Hebrew, and he was possibly related to the royal house; but he was none the less emphatic in his denunciation of upper-class selfishness. "How is the faithful city become a harlot!" he exclaimed. "It was full of judgment; justice dwelt in it; but now, murderers. Thy silver is turned into dross; thy wine is mingled with water. Thy princes are rebellious, companions of thieves. Every one loveth bribes and runneth after rewards. They judge not the fatherless, and the widow's cause cometh not in to them."[26] Against the rich men's greed for land, he cried, "Woe to them that join house to house and lay field to field, even to the end of the place!"; and then asked bitterly, "Shall you alone dwell in the midst of the earth?"[27]

Under divine inspiration Isaias predicted the punishment of the guilty. "The Lord will enter into judgment with the ancients of his people and its princes; for you have devoured the vineyard, and the spoil of the poor is in your house. How is it that you crush my people and grind the faces of the poor? saith the Lord, the God of hosts."[28] The divine punishment would be a sad contrast to the existing luxury of the wealthy. With bitter thoroughness Isaias enumerated the trifling feminine vanities which were occupying the thoughts and attention of the proud daughters of Sion. In the day of reckoning the Lord would sweep these things away and, added the prophet, "it shall come to pass that instead of balsam there shall be a stench, and instead of a girdle, a cord, and instead of curled hair, baldness, and instead of a stomacher, haircloth."[29] Eventually the prophecies of Isaias were fulfilled with terrible accuracy. After many tribulations Jerusalem was destroyed by Nabuchodonosor in 586 B.C.

A third and final example of the divine condemnation of bourgeois selfishness will be taken from the New Testament. St. James addresses the bourgeoisie of his own day in much the same language as was used by Amos and Isaias and the other prophets. He writes: "Come now, you rich, weep and howl over your miseries which will come upon you. Your riches have rotted, and your garments have become moth-eaten. Your gold and silver are rusted; and their rust will be a witness against you, and will devour your flesh as fire does. You have laid up treasure in the last days. Behold, the wages of the laborers who reaped your fields, which have been kept back by you unjustly, cry out; and their cry has entered into the ears of the Lord of Hosts. You have feasted upon earth, and you have nourished your hearts on dissipation in the day of slaughter. You have condemned and put to death the just, and he did not resist you."[30] Again, addressing the ordinary Christians, St.

James asks, "Do not the rich use their power to oppress you, and do they not drag you before judgment-seats? Do they not blaspheme the good name by which you are called?"[31]

If these evils belonged exclusively to the far-distant past, if they concerned only Israel and Judah twenty-seven centuries ago or Palestine in the days of St. James, then one might pass them by with less attention. But this is not the case. They are present only too visibly in the United States in the twentieth century. This is a severe indictment, but how can it be denied? Pope Pius XI was speaking about the modern capitalistic world in general when he wrote, "The whole economic life has become hard, merciless, and sinister, in a ghastly manner."[32] Who would make bold to maintain that conditions in this country have formed a happy exception to this generalization?

The study and criticism of the economic structure of the United States is a highly technical subject. It cannot be adequately discussed in the space available here.[33] It is certain, however, and beyond all reasonable doubt that giant corporations dominate the economic life of this country to an alarming extent and that a comparatively small group of powerful men dictate the policies of these corporations. Thus a few individuals largely control the business of the nation and through their financial power begin to dominate other aspects of the country's life as well. It is precisely the situation described by Pope Pius XI: "It is obvious to all that in our days there is not only an accumulation of capital but also of enormous power and despotic economic domination in the hands of a few who frequently are not the owners but only the trustees and administrators of invested funds which they control at their own good pleasure. . . . This concentration of power leads in turn to a threefold struggle for domination. First, there is the struggle for dictatorship in the economic sphere itself; then there

is the fierce battle for control of the State so that its power and resources may be abused in the economic strife; finally, the clash between States themselves."[34]

One tragic result of the economic situation in the United States is the very unequal and unfair distribution of income. While the rich have enjoyed during times of peace enormous earnings which have enabled them to live in luxury, the poor have suffered acutely. A famous study carried out by the Brookings Institution estimated that at 1929 prices a family income of $2,000 per year might "perhaps be regarded as sufficient to supply only basic necessities," and estimated that in that year about 60 per cent of American families were below that income level.[35] This, remember, was in 1929, that golden year of enormous prosperity. Yet even then three-fifths of the families of the country were below the level of "basic necessities." The average American family was poor. If this was the picture in a year of plenty, one can well imagine the conditions which existed in 1932 a lean year when the national income sank to less than a half of the 1929 total! Perhaps the fairest way to judge the situation is to consider a more normal year like 1935–36, a period of moderate prosperity. In that year 65 per cent of the nation's "consumer units" (families and single individuals) received less than $1,500, 42 per cent less than $1,000, and 14 per cent less than $500.[36] A person with insight can read in these cold figures a tragic story of unspeakable human misery!

If we American Catholics regarded our contemporary conditions as Amos and Isaias and St. James regarded theirs, we would be on fire with indignation. Our fury would not let us rest until we had denounced avarice from the housetops, until we had used every legitimate means to end a scandalous situation which condemns the poor to misery and bitter suffering. In the meantime we would strip ourselves of all but the barest necessities to relieve the needs of our Saviour suffering in the persons of the wretched

poor, trembling as we reflected on those words of horror which shall be spoken on Judgment Day: "Depart from me, accursed ones, into the everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels. For I was hungry, and you did not give me to eat; I was thirsty and you gave me no drink; I was a stranger and you did not take me in; naked, and you did not clothe me."[37] A raging indignation toward the unjust rich and an overwhelming pity for the comfortless poor are the emotions imposed on us by the very logic of the situation. Unless our hearts are torn with such passionate feelings, how are we the spiritual sons of Christ, the angry Christ, whip in hand, who drove the businessmen from the Temple, the compassionate Christ, tears in His sacred eyes, who could never look unmoved on the misery of His poor?

One day a wretched man was lying by Jericho Road, bruised, beaten and half dead. "As it happened, a certain priest was going down the same way; and when he saw him, he passed by."[38] Why is it that we Catholics — yes, we Catholic priests — can do the same thing? How is it that we can pass through the miserable slums where wretchedness abounds and, seeing these things, pass by? We pass by without reflecting that these conditions cry to heaven for vengeance. How can we be so unthinking? Or are we unthinking? Rather, perhaps, we are cowardly. We are afraid to offend the wealthy by raising our voices about the things we have seen and heard. We are afraid of criticism, afraid of ridicule, afraid of being called radicals and extremists. And so we play the part of conformists. The burning words of the great encyclicals are not on our lips, nor the words of Amos, Isaias, and James.

Put down this book a moment, reader, and recall the Sunday sermons you have heard. How often have you heard a sermon against covetousness, which, as you know, is one of the seven capital sins? How often have you seen another Amos in the pulpit, trembling with wrath as he denounced

the selfishness of the privileged few, another St. James, condemning in stern, plain language the injustice of the capitalist who holds back from the workingman the money which he has justly earned? Jesus Christ did not hesitate at physical violence when He saw businessmen doing what was wrong. Are we so effete that we do not even dare to follow the lead of the Holy Father in condemning the excesses of the modern capitalistic regime?

It is true, obviously true, that we must be guided by charity in denouncing the sins of the bourgeoisie. The great encyclicals have nothing in common with the Marxian spirit of class hatred. Our Lord loved the very men who cringed under His lash in the Temple — loved them enough to die for them along with the rest of mankind. But it is not charity to conceal the evils of capitalism. It is not charity but cowardice to remain silent in the presence of sin. All of us, priests and lay people, have a safe guide in the pronouncements of the Holy See. We shall not sin against charity if we make our own the strong language which the Popes have used in censuring the vices of the modern economic world. On the contrary, we shall be guilty if we hold our peace where Rome has spoken.

If we Catholics are to struggle seriously against the bourgeois spirit, then we must demand a great deal of assistance from our colleges. In these colleges a large part of our future priests and religious and our future lay leaders receive their training. The orientation they receive in undergraduate days is likely to be rather permanent. It is a serious responsibility of the colleges to train Catholic youth in correct social principles and correct attitudes in matters affecting society. Are our American Catholic colleges today accomplishing this purpose? This question can be answered by applying a test as simple as it is infallible. If our colleges are turning out graduates who bear on themselves the image of Christ, whose attitude toward social matters is Christ's own attitude, then these colleges are accom-

plishing their full purpose. If this is not the case, then they are failing. Remember, Christ was a workingman. He loved the poor and He loved poverty. He denounced the excesses of the bourgeoisie. Do we dare to assert that His attitude toward wealth is also characteristic of our typical Catholic college graduates?

Too often, one fears, our colleges make some concessions to the bourgeois spirit. On visiting one of these institutions one frequently sees well-kept lawns, an imposing façade, polished columns, marble floors, beautifully appointed rooms. These things are impressive, but they cost money and the college has a huge debt. To meet interest payments it is necessary to have a good enrollment with, preferably, a generous sprinkling of students from prosperous families. It helps also if the faculty does not have a reputation for teaching extreme doctrines on economic matters — that sort of thing hardly attracts wealthy donors. There is a comfortable air of moderate prosperity about the students. Some of them come from unprosperous homes; but parents are willing to scrimp and save so that their children will be "well-dressed" and therefore not conspicuously out of harmony with the atmosphere of the college.

In the majority of cases the faculty of the college consists of religious men or women who are vowed to poverty and who keep their vows with edifying fidelity. They sleep in narrow cells, they eat plain food, they have neither time nor money for worldly diversions. For all their human imperfections, their lives are visibly marked with the sign of Nazareth. But how often these same religious fail to preach voluntary poverty to their students! A nun once told me that it was only after she entered the community that she learned that the sisters wore aprons when they cleaned the chapel. It seems that they used to lock the door when they did this task so that they would not be seen doing manual work and thus lose the respect of the students! A straw which shows which way the wind blows. If

the faculty must be ashamed of manual work, a strange spirit must be dominant in the college. One wonders whether a working-class girl — the Blessed Virgin, for example — would feel at home in a college like that. Sometimes incidents occur which seem to show that colleges now and then reflect the attitude of the employer class, in practice if not in theory. A student in a Catholic institution, not many years ago, was following a course in which the papal doctrine on the living wage was being eloquently expounded. Being of a somewhat curious disposition, he interviewed some of the manual workers employed by the institution and found that their wage scale was strikingly low. He brought the situation to the attention of the college authorities, but with no result except considerable embarrassment. Yet the living conditions of the students in this college were definitely above the average. The contrast between the physical comfort of the employer class and substandard wages for the workers is something that embitters labor agitators.

The success of our fight against the bourgeois spirit and all the evils that it engenders must depend in large measure on the work of those Catholic organizations which are concerned with social questions of one sort or other. For, although all the activities of the Church touch social issues in some way, it is these organizations which deal with society most explicitly and most directly. Non-Catholics who have never read the papal pronouncements look to them for expressions of the Catholic attitude. Politicians, alert to gauge the currents of public opinion, watch them in order to estimate the trend of Catholic thought. These organizations, therefore, occupy a strategic position in our fight for social betterment. Broadly speaking, they constitute the Catholic social movement in any given time and place.

A Catholic organization of this sort is good precisely in proportion as it reflects the spirit of Christ. Christ

dressed like a poor man. He preached to the common people in the synagogues. When His plain speech made Him unacceptable to the authorities there, He spoke by the roadside, in open fields, on the beaches by the Sea of Galilee. Our Catholic organizations are likely to meet in good hotels. There is a quiet air of prosperity in the place. The floors are thickly carpeted and well-trained servants are attentive to our comfort. We take the elevator to the grand ballroom for the meeting. There is a hum of quiet conversation. One looks around and sees men and women dressed not luxuriously but with the quiet good taste of the bourgeoisie. This is definitely a white-collar group and a workingman, dressed like Jesus of Nazareth in the shabby clothes of his class, would feel out of place here. It is unfortunate that the communists are less fastidious at their meetings. Communism grows.

Now a hush falls upon the audience. The speaker is being introduced and presently he takes his place at the rostrum. He is a professor from a state university, or is he the head of a minor government bureau? At least it happens that he is not a Catholic. He is a thoroughgoing materialist as a matter of fact, but he is also a gentleman and he does not have the bad taste to offend his Catholic audience. He says the proper things. The next speaker is a priest. He has worked among the poor and he knows them at firsthand. What is more, he has a real and deep love for the poor. He had intended to give vent to his pent-up indignation; but as he faces his refined audience, somehow it does not seem like the proper time to do so. He allows himself to be overawed. He, too, says the proper things.

Finally the time for the closing session has come. The chairman of the Committee on Resolutions comes forward to present his report. Now, if ever, is the time for plain speaking. The early Christians prayed to the Lord, "Grant to thy servants to speak thy word with all boldness."[39] But is this, after all, the "prudent" thing to do? Perhaps

"this is not the right time." Perhaps, if we speak too plainly, we shall alienate an important section of public opinion. So let us pass a resolution against obscene literature. That is safe enough. No one will dare to defend the opposite point of view in public. If we must touch on economic matters at all, let us confine ourselves to generalities; then no one will be offended. As to speaking the word with all boldness — well, perhaps some other time.

To exorcize the mystery of iniquity, bold, violent measures are necessary. When it is a question of the bourgeois spirit in particular, the violence had better begin at home. When we are not overawed by wealth, when we dare to be poor, then the cynical world will begin to take us seriously and listen to what we have to say. Hardly any man is so steeped in cynicism that he can remain entirely unmoved in the presence of heroism. A speaker who has the courage of his convictions always has an attentive audience. The publicans and the Pharisees left their comfortable homes and went out into the Desert of Judea to listen to John the Baptist. Here was a man who deserved a hearing; for "John himself had a garment of camel's hair and a leathern girdle about his loins, and his food was locusts and wild honey."[40] The Pharisees might hate John, but they had to take him seriously; for the pestiferous fellow actually practised what he preached!

We, too, can attack the bourgeois spirit successfully when we practice what we preach. That means voluntary poverty. Voluntary poverty — how people shudder at the words! And yet, why should they? In Catholic ascetical tradition voluntary poverty is the merest commonplace. Every religious is vowed to the practice of poverty under pain of sin. The saints sold what they possessed and gave to the poor, or, if that was not feasible, they took care that they should not benefit personally by the wealth that was technically theirs. St. Louis IX of France could not very well give away his property — it did not belong to him per-

sonally but to the crown of France. However, he himself kept aloof from his wealth. *Vestitu vulgari utebatur,* says the Breviary lesson, he dressed like a man of the people. Great monarch that he was, St. Louis still knew how to imitate the spirit of Nazareth.

Voluntary poverty is a thoroughly practical technique of Catholic action. It is practical because poverty does not mean destitution. Voluntary poverty may be defined as the practice of neither saving nor spending money unreasonably or selfishly. There is nothing irrational or impractical about such a program. Let a man spend what he needs to for decent clothing, wholesome food, adequate shelter, moderate recreation, and proper medical attention, and then let him give the balance to the poor. What is unreasonable about that?

The Catholic conformists try to undermine the concept of voluntary poverty by abusing the principle that a man should live in accordance with his state of life. They misinterpret this principle to mean that a Catholic with a ten thousand dollar income should live like other men on that income level and a Catholic millionaire should live like other millionaires. Of course this absurd conclusion destroys the whole ideal of voluntary poverty. What the principle really means is that a man should not hesitate to spend on himself whatever is necessary to follow his vocation properly. A Catholic physician may practice real poverty and yet spend a liberal amount on office equipment, instruments, medical books, and a car which will not break down in an emergency. Since his profession is important, it is reasonable for him to hire someone else to mow his lawn and take care of his furnace. Also, no one expects a physician to attend his patients in overalls. The result is that a medical man may have to spend on himself very much more than a carpenter or a policeman would. Such is the principle of spending money in accordance with one's state of life.

However, after all due allowances have been made, it remains true that a Catholic is not practising voluntary poverty in any sense if he habitually spends money on himself without good cause. A woman is not practising poverty if she discards dresses before they are worn out because she is tired of them or because they are no longer the latest fashion. Overexpensive automobiles, an epicure's cuisine, the luxurious amusements of the idle rich — these things cannot be reconciled with the spirit of poverty by any stretch of the imagination. If a Catholic loves the appearance of prosperity, if he insists that his dress and his style of living must exhibit him before the public as a "successful" man, then he has most certainly broken with the spirit of Nazareth and the fact is too patent to be contradicted. There is no possible way to compromise between the bourgeois spirit and the Catholic ideal of voluntary poverty. They are as different as night and day. It is only a waste of time to try to serve mammon and God at the same time. The choice is unavoidable.

Great causes are worthy of great efforts. If we are to overcome the bourgeois spirit which holds the modern world in thrall, we must be prepared to suffer during the battle. There is no easy way to accomplish the task. It calls for holy violence toward ourselves. It calls for the practice of real poverty and poverty is not pleasant. It calls for the courage to speak the truth fearlessly though we suffer as a result. It is by such methods that the mammon of wickedness is to be defeated.

Chapter 7

CONFORMIST SOCIAL WORK

ST. JOHN CANTIUS (Jan z Kanty) was a professor at the University of Kraków in Poland in the fifteenth century. He was known during his lifetime for his intellectual acumen but still more for his extraordinary generosity toward the poor. With them he shared everything he had; he would give them even his own meals. After St. John's death the University decided to honor his memory by feeding a poor man every day at dinner. This action was accompanied by a beautiful ceremony. When dinner was ready the vice-president of the University would cry out in Latin, "A poor man is coming," to which the president, as though amending the sentiment, would reply, "Jesus Christ is coming," whereupon the guest was served.

This ceremony illustrates very clearly what the attitude of a Catholic toward the poor must be. When we give alms we do a service, not to a poor man, but to Christ. Within the Mystical Body there is an organic unity between Christ, the head, and His members who are our neighbors. Our Lord accepts as done to Himself personally whatever we do to one of His members, even the most insignificant. "Amen I say to you, as long as you did it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me."[1] This dogmatic truth gives Catholic charity its unique quality. The unbelieving philanthropist, moved by a commendable human pity, treats the poor man like a fellow human being. The Catholic must treat him like Christ!

Admittedly this is a surprising principle; but the saints

put it into practice extraordinarily well. They had for the poor, not a detached scientific interest, but a warm personal love mingled with a certain strange reverence. The sufferings of the needy stirred them to the very depths. They could not bear to rest and take their ease while the poor were suffering. They sacrificed their luxuries, their comforts, then even their necessities. St. Francis of Assisi embracing the leper can serve as a sort of symbol of the general attitude of the saints toward the needy.

Not all Catholics are saints; but they are all bound to imitate the basic attitude of the saints toward the poor because in the poor they must see Christ. This fact has given Catholic charity a certain flavor of its own, distinguishing it from the philanthropy of unbelievers — as long, at least, as Catholics are faithful to their own traditions. Thus there has grown up in the Church a body of attitudes, principles, and methods, and these constitute traditional Catholic charity as it has been known and practiced down through the centuries. Problems change with the changing times, methods change in detail with increasing knowledge, forms of organization vary from generation to generation, but the essentials of the great tradition remain unaltered.

Traditional Catholic charity is distinguished, in the first place, by its supernatural viewpoint. Its aim is to relieve the temporal necessities of man, but in addition to do something infinitely more important, that is, to help people attain heaven. In Catholic eyes, it is a small service to aid the body and forget the soul. The motive for helping the needy is not mere human compassion, not a mere feeling of fellowship, but the supernatural virtue of charity which is a divine sort of love, as far above human love as heaven is above earth. Genuine charity is an unspeakably intense, restless virtue which gives its possessors no peace until they have given of themselves to the utmost. As a result Catholic charity has a certain romantic quality which often puzzles unbelievers.

The methods of traditional Catholic charity are both natural and supernatural. In so far as its methods are natural, they do not differ strikingly from those of non-Catholic philanthropy. It is simply a matter of applying to human needs the most effective remedies which natural reason can suggest. On the other hand there is, as one would expect, a sharp antithesis between the two traditions in their respective attitudes toward the use of supernatural means. Such methods are an integral part of the work of Catholic charity. Prayer, penance, the sacraments — these things are quite obvious means of relieving the poor in the eyes of the Church. The unbelieving philanthropist fails to see their efficacy at all.[2]

Traditional Catholic charity can be studied in a pure form in the work of those religious communities which devote themselves to work among the poor. For example, the Little Sisters of the Poor take care of the aged and the sick who are unable to provide for themselves. The sisters are forbidden by rule to receive endowments or fixed incomes; they live entirely on alms. All the work in their houses is done by the sisters themselves and the inmates, as there are no paid employees. The Helpers of the Holy Souls, many of whom left prosperous homes to enter the community, visit the homes of the poor and do not hesitate to do the most menial tasks. The Sisters of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd of Angers (Good Shepherd nuns) are a cloistered community devoted to the care of delinquent girls or girls rescued from dangerous surroundings. In the seclusion of the cloister miracles of grace are performed which would leave anyone skeptical who had not seen the work of the sisters at firsthand. A score of other communities might be mentioned whose work is equally edifying. All have in common an intense spirit of personal sacrifice amounting to heroism, a simple faith in supernatural means, and a warm, personal love of Christ in the person of the poor.

Side by side with Catholic charity, another tradition, a tradition of secular philanthropy, has long been developing. Such philanthropy existed, of course, in the Greco-Roman world, but it was submerged during the Middle Ages when almsgiving and the care of the needy in general were motivated almost exclusively by religious considerations. With the Protestant Reformation much of the property of the Church was secularized; and many poor persons who had depended on some monastery or pious foundation for help were left without resource. This factor, among others, led the State to take on new responsibilities in the care of the poor.

The character of secular philanthropy has changed radically since the early nineteenth century with the gradual development of social work. There has been, first of all, an effort to apply scientific methods to the relief of the needy. Thomas Chalmers (1780–1820), a Scottish clergyman working among the poor of Glasgow, became dissatisfied with the results of the English poor law and proposed certain new methods among which was the careful investigation of each poor family before relief was given. His ideas lay dormant for some time but gradually they began to influence opinion, first in England and then in the United States. Social workers began to collect an enormous mass of details concerning each case they served; these facts were filed for future reference in bulky folders. The ideal was to imitate the method of the physician who first studies each patient scientifically and then treats him on the basis of the insight thus acquired. These methods were systematized and formulated in 1917 by Mary E. Richmond in her *Social Diagnosis,* a book which long served as the social worker's Bible.

In the meantime there had been a tendency to unite the small, isolated charitable agencies into larger organizations. The first Charity Organisation Society was founded in London in 1869 and the tendency spread. Gradually, also,

social work became professionalized. The paid worker took the place of the earlier volunteer who had given her time freely to the service of the poor. More and more attention was given to the training of workers, until now the generally recognized standard in the United States is two years of specialized training in a professional school after college graduation.

While these developments were taking place, the inner spirit of social work was gradually changing. In the early days the movement had a strong religious tinge, but as time went on this became less and less pronounced. Partly this change was due to the spirit of the age, as Victorian religious ideals faded into modern materialism. Partly it was due to the growth of large charitable organizations which brought together persons of different religious beliefs and of no belief. Persons of such divergent backgrounds could not very well be expected to agree on a common religious platform; the easiest solution seemed to be to omit questions of religion entirely. The enormous development in the United States of social work under Federal auspices has recently become an important factor — for the government is traditionally neutral in matters of religion. The result has been that, with exceptions here and there, social work has been entirely secularized in its orientation.

The secularization of social work does not raise very serious problems as long as poverty is the sole difficulty faced by the persons with whom the social worker deals. It is possible to give food and clothing and money to a poor man without discussing religion and ethics with him. But when the main problem is a conduct problem the situation is something else again. In such a case the social worker must have some sort of an ethical standard to diagnose the seriousness of the issue; and she must have some sort of ethical motives to set before her client to induce him to mend his ways. Often the worker must shoulder the responsibility of working out a new plan of life for an entire

family, and in this situation questions of ethics cannot be evaded.

Before social work became so largely secularized, it was easier to deal with problems of behavior. The social worker and her client could turn to a common religion and discuss these problems in the light of their common belief. When religion evaporated from social work, something else had to be found to take its place. During the 1920's this need began to be supplied from an unexpected source. Freudian psychiatry began to influence social work to an extraordinary degree. Of course, there can be no doubt at all about the value of psychiatry in treating the mentally ill. It has proved its worth beyond question.[3] But social workers not only used psychiatry; they abused it. Often workers with a mere smattering of the subject looked to it for the answer to all ethical problems. In their distorted view it became almost a new religion. The psychiatrist took the place of the clergyman and the clinic replaced the church. Temptations became mental mechanisms and sins became behavior problems. Add to psychiatry an element of modern liberalism and a *soupçon* of the earlier social idealism of the Jane Addams type, and you have the strange compound which has supplied the place of religion for many a social worker outside the Church.

The abandonment of religion and of all sound ethics by so many practitioners has had a very sinister effect on social work. Many a social worker tries to rebuild the life of a family in accordance with the vague and faulty sort of ideals mentioned in the last paragraph. This is the sort of thing which she has absorbed in her professional training. The influence of a worker over a family can be very dominating. Not only does she have the prestige of a professional woman and a member of a higher social class, but often she has the power to give or withhold relief and uses this power as a weapon to enforce her strange standards on decent people. Sometimes a poor client is faced with the

practical alternative of practicing contraception at the social worker's order or starving when she has cut off his relief. Under these circumstances social work has something in common with prostitution; for then the social worker, like the harlot, is paid for inducing people to break the Sixth Commandment.

Of course, not all non-Catholic social work is as bad as this. Many members of the profession have wholesome ethical ideals of their own; and when they deal with Catholic clients they try to be fair. They may even refer cases to a parish priest so that he may have the opportunity to give religious help. Then there are many forms of social work which are merely concerned with granting monetary relief; in this case the work is almost purely economic, and ethical and religious questions do not loom large. Where, however, social work touches on human conduct and attempts to mold people's lives, it is unsatisfactory at best whenever it is secular, at worst it can be a most pernicious influence and an ally of the mystery of iniquity.

Secular social work rubs shoulders with traditional Catholic charity in modern America. To what extent has the former influenced the latter? Before trying to answer this question it is important to note that Catholic charitable activities fall into two rather well-defined groups. The first group is essentially traditional in its methods. It comprises, first of all, the work of religious communities in child-caring homes, institutions for the aged, and homes for delinquent boys and girls. It comprises also the work of lay organizations, such as the St. Vincent de Paul Society, and the informal work of parish priests in their daily contact with the poor. In all these instances the influence of supernatural motives and the use of supernatural means are consciously prominent, and the impact of modern social work is relatively little noticeable.

Another section of Catholic charitable work conforms much more closely, at least in external things, to the pattern

of modern social work. By and large Catholic case-working agencies which do family visiting and place dependent children in foster homes have the same outward appearance as similar non-Catholic agencies. In either case the agency has a central office which looks, at first glance, much like any business office with its desks and filing cabinets, its typewriters and telephones, its busy stenographers, telephone operators, and bookkeepers. Its case workers have been largely trained in professional schools which follow in outline much the same curriculum, whether they are Catholic or secular. A closer study of these agencies shows that they follow much the same standardized practices in dealing with their clients. Both types of agencies may be financed by a common community fund, in whose annual drive for money Catholics and non-Catholics participate side by side. Representatives from both groups serve together on committees which discuss the common problems of social work in the city. When state or national societies in the field of social work meet for their regular conventions, workers from both Catholic and secular agencies attend and appear on the program, speaking much the same language.

The observation of these facts proves that a good many Catholic agencies have taken over the externals of secular social work. What is to be thought of this tendency? It is impossible to answer this question *a priori*. Each one of the techniques which has been taken over deserves to be examined separately on its own merits. This is a task which cannot be attempted here. In any case there can be no blanket objection against the willingness of Catholics to learn modern methods from non-Catholics whenever the methods themselves can stand up under a careful scrutiny. It seems safe to say, too, that many of these modern techniques are good, that they do not violate the spirit of the Catholic tradition, and that they are praiseworthy in that they help in giving more efficacious aid to the poor.

A more delicate and infinitely more important question

is whether some Catholic agencies or at least some individual Catholic social workers have taken over some part of the secular spirit of modern philanthropy along with its techniques. It is easy to see how there is a danger that this might occur. Catholic social workers are exposed to the secular tradition at many points. They are often trained in a nonsectarian social work school. If they go to a Catholic school, they must use non-Catholic texts and reference books because Catholic books on these specialized subjects scarcely exist. For her field work training the student may go to a nonsectarian agency, there to be trained perhaps under a non-Catholic supervisor. After graduation she perhaps holds a number of different positions, some of them in nonsectarian agencies. To keep abreast of developments in her field she reads the current literature and attends conventions where she learns little about the Catholic tradition. Unless she is extraordinarily well grounded in her faith, she is likely to acquire the habit of solving the daily problems of her work by thoroughly secular principles.

Even in a Catholic social agency there is much to distract the unreflective worker from the great tradition of Catholic charity. The very circumstances of her employment are a break with tradition. The work of religious communities which deal with the poor is carried on by men and women vowed to poverty. They consecrate themselves to a hard life from supernatural motives. The paid social worker has professional status and a salary commensurate with it. Of course, the social worker cannot be censured for accepting a salary. She earns every dollar she receives. Yet it is impossible to overlook the contrast between the nun who herself lives in poverty as she serves the poor and the social worker who receives the salary of a professional woman. The paid social worker must sometimes face embarrassing situations. Even as a beginner she receives, perhaps, a salary of $150 a month. She goes into the slums and deals with entire families which must live on $60 a month supplied

by her agency. Worse still, she must sometimes knock at the door of a poor hovel and say, "Mrs. Jones, our agency must unfortunately stop giving you your monthly relief check; we are short of funds." Mrs. Jones says, "Yes, ma'am." One may imagine what she thinks.

The routine procedure of modernized Catholic social agencies is taken over so largely from secular social work that it is easy to forget that these things are only externals, and that the fundamental spirit of the agency should be that of supernatural charity. The saints had enormous success among the poor because they used such supernatural means as prayer and penance. When the Catholic social worker faces a particularly difficult problem, does she turn to prayer for a solution? The nun who works among the poor does so almost automatically. One fears that the social worker does so less frequently. One may attend a good many case conferences in a Catholic social agency without ever hearing that there is a certain kind of unclean spirit which "can be cast out in no way except by prayer and fasting."[4] In the present writer's experience the workers are much more likely to turn to psychiatry and attempt the impossible.

Some interesting data on the Catholicity of Catholic social workers have been gathered by Dr. Lauerman, director of the National Catholic School of Social Service, and will be published in a forthcoming study.[5] He gave a simple test of Catholic doctrine to a number of social workers all of whom were graduates of Catholic colleges and also graduates of either Catholic or nonsectarian professional schools of social work. On each item he asked for a statement of the Church's doctrine and a simple proof of it. The results were a bit appalling. The social workers were decidedly shaky on fundamental principles which must be regarded as basic in the Catholic treatment of the poor. For example, only three fifths of the total group could make a correct statement on the supernatural order and only one third could support it with proof. In the face of such ignorance who can be sur-

prised if the workers in our agencies are not always inclined to face their problems in a supernatural manner? There seemed to be a good deal of uncertainty on such topics as the natural law, the effect of heredity and environment on the freedom of the will, the Church's doctrine on capital and labor, and similar topics. Even in the discussion of contraception three "absolutely wrong" statements occurred. Although the graduates of Catholic schools of social work averaged better than the graduates of nonsectarian schools, ignorance of Catholic doctrine was widespread in both groups.

All in all it is hard to escape the conclusion that the great tradition of Catholic charity has been somewhat diluted by secular influences in our modernized Catholic social agencies. It has not been an unmixed blessing that the paid lay social worker has supplanted the nun in much of our work among the poor. Sometimes it becomes a bit difficult to sense the spirit of Christ amid the clatter of typewriters and the jangle of telephones in an up-to-date Catholic charities office. As our activities in this field have become more modern, more "efficient," have they also become nearer to the spirit of St. John Bosco or St. Vincent de Paul? One would like to think so, but one wonders.

Doubtless the spirit of Catholic conformism is responsible for some of the changes which have taken place. It flatters the pride of some Catholics to know that their social agencies put into practice those very same modern methods which are praised so highly by the followers of the secular tradition. On the other hand it requires a rare type of moral courage, which most people lack, to break sharply with the secular spirit and strike out along lines which will be criticized as "old-fashioned" because they are traditional and Catholic.

The existing state of our modernized Catholic social agencies is not, however, due entirely to the spirit of conformism. It is partly due to external pressure. Some of this

pressure comes from the community chests which raise funds for all the social agencies of a city in an intensive annual campaign. Often the local bureau of Catholic charities is practically forced to become a member of the chest because otherwise it would be very hard to raise the necessary funds. Community chests lay down rules which the participating agencies must follow, and these rules are inspired, as one would expect, by the principles of secular social work. Thus Catholic agencies can be prevented from doing anything which secular social workers would regard as too highly unorthodox.

Pressure is exerted also on the social workers themselves. The American Association of Social Workers is an enormous professional organization with very definite principles about the sort of training a social worker should receive and the type of work she should do. It is the desire of this organization that all social workers be professionally trained in schools accredited by the American Association of Schools of Social Work. The result of the work of this association is that it is hard for a young woman to get a really desirable job in social work and harder still for her to advance in her profession unless she has attended a certain type of school with a certain type of curriculum. Whether the school happens to be under Catholic or under nonsectarian auspices, the student's training must conform to standards prescribed by the leaders of secular social work. Any individual in the field of social work who should revolt too daringly against these standards, and should strike out boldly in the direction of traditional Catholic charity would find himself suddenly very much isolated and even boycotted. Revolt against vested interests is not easy.

There is room for a type of Catholic charitable activity which would revolt frankly against the secular tradition and yet be prepared to accept whatever is praiseworthy in the latest modern methods. It is high time for the Catholic charities of the United States to issue their declaration of

independence. As long as we try to keep up even an external appearance of conformity to secular social work we shall find it very difficult to return to the spirit of the Gospels. Our principles and the principles of secular philanthropy are worlds apart; it follows that our organizations and our methods must be strikingly different also.

The work of Dorothy Day in her "houses of hospitality" and the work of other lay persons inspired by similar principles can furnish at least some useful hints, although the work of these houses is still too highly experimental, still too informally organized, to be copied literally. It is inspiring, however, to see the willingness of young lay people, often coming from comfortable homes, to live among the poor, share their hard life, and devote themselves to the service of the needy without thought of salary. In the work of these young people there is something closer to the spirit of Christ and the saints than there is in the sophisticated techniques of the professional social worker. Is there not some way to combine the generous enthusiasm of Dorothy Day's work with the order and system of a modernized Catholic charities office? When some genius arises who can make this happy combination, then our lay social work will return to the great tradition of Catholic charity from which our religious communities have never departed. The day when this occurs will be a great day for the Church in America.

Chapter 8

CONFORMISM AND THE LABOR PROBLEM

AS THIS chapter is being written, two piles of books and pamphlets lie on my desk. The literature in each pile deals with various aspects of the labor problem, and all of it is written by Catholics and published under the auspices of Catholic organizations devoted to the subject. One pile consists of American publications. It is quite a miscellaneous assortment and it probably constitutes a fair cross section of the type of literature it represents. The other pile is made up of books and pamphlets published by the Belgian and French Jocistes and allied groups. In this case also the collection is probably miscellaneous enough to be representative. It is very instructive to compare the viewpoints expressed in the two collections of literature.

The discussions in the American publications center on the economic aspects of the labor problem with criticisms based on sound Catholic ethics. The problems of the workingman are not considered in isolation but in their relation to all the other features of the American economy. This breadth of viewpoint leads to the study of property, income, prices, agriculture, and the spirit of capitalism. The condition of the worker is handled in some detail. The American labor movement and current social legislation are discussed realistically and, evidently, on the basis of firsthand knowledge. The writers are unsparing in their criticism of American industrialism. Again and again they stress the conclusion that the only fundamental remedy for the present

economic ills is the adoption of the papal plan for the reorganization of economic society.

The writers of these publications are persons distinguished for their expert knowledge of the subjects they treat. They are far from being armchair theorists. Whether they are priests or lay people, they are professionally engaged in work which gives them daily contact with the matters they discuss. The longer reports are usually signed by priests, but there appear also the names of labor leaders, industrialists, government officials, lawyers, editors, and indeed of all sorts of experts whose specialized knowledge might throw light on the matter in hand. As one reads one feels a comforting sense of security in the competence of these specialists.

The outstanding writers in this group seem to be equally at home in their knowledge of current economic conditions and in their grasp of Catholic ethics. The result is that they speak with a tone of authority. When they criticize, they criticize not on the basis of emotion and enthusiasm but on the basis of sound ethical principles. The principal encyclicals are at their finger tips. When they propose collective bargaining and good labor legislation as immediate goals and the complete reorganization of economic society as the ultimate goal, they justify their position by liberal quotations from the papal pronouncements. On the other hand, there is little in this American Catholic labor literature about the more strictly theological doctrines of the encyclicals. The labor problem is treated ethically and economically rather than theologically. Perhaps the objective is to secure the cooperation of non-Catholics by setting down a platform based on sound natural reason.

Before discussing the Jociste literature, it may be in place to say a few words about the organization itself for the benefit of those readers who may be unfamiliar with it. The word *Jociste* is coined from the initial letters of the official name of the movement, *Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne*

(Christian Working Youth). The founder, Canon Cardijn, was the son of a Belgian working class family. Even as a boy he was saddened by the tragic barrier existing between the working class and the Church. He resolved to do what he could to remove this deplorable misunderstanding. Later, beside the deathbed of his father, he consecrated himself to the undertaking by a solemn vow. After World War I he began to put his ideas into practice in Brussels; and in 1924 the movement received its present name and the approval of the Belgian episcopate. Organizations of a parallel character for agricultural youth, students, and others were also founded by Canon Cardijn's zeal. Before World War II the movement had spread to a number of other countries. At present a few zealous priests are experimenting with Jocism in the United States.

On comparing the Jociste literature with the writings of American Catholics on the labor question, one finds a number of differences. Naturally some of these are accidental and due to the dissimilarity of conditions here and abroad. Three differences, however, seem to be more fundamental and deserve consideration here. First of all, Jocism seems to be much more properly "working class" in spirit than the various organizations represented in the American literature. All the Jocistes, including the paid lay leaders of the movement, are actual working class boys and girls while the priests serving as chaplains are very close to the workers. The American writers are all experts interested in the working class but they seem to be less integrally a part of it. Reading the American publications, one gains a broad view of the place of the workingman in the country's economy. Reading the Jociste literature, one learns what it feels like to belong to the working class. The Jocistes are interested in the life of the worker in all its homely details. Their publications are intensely practical, and no feature of factory life is too insignificant to be brought up and discussed.

No one can doubt that the Jocistes understand working class life with extraordinary intimacy.

In the second place, the Jocistes have a much broader conception of the nature of the problems of the working class. The American discussions seem to be confined almost exclusively to the economic aspects of the workingman's life. Wages and hours constantly occupy the center of attention. In contrast, Jocism is interested in working class life from every point of view, economic, intellectual, social, civic, moral, and religious. The emphasis on religion is particularly significant. It would not be a great service to the workingman to double his pay and halve his hours if his spiritual condition were to be neglected. No one can really help the working class unless he puts religion in the first place. Canon Cardijn puts the Catholic labor leader to the test when he asks dramatically, "Are you convinced to the point of being ready to die for your conviction that the mass of young workers need a religious formation?"[1] Beside this overwhelming enthusiasm the constant preoccupation of the American writers about wages and hours seems pale indeed.

A third difference concerns the nature of the means to be used to aid the laboring class. The American literature continually harps on collective bargaining and social legislation. The Jocistes emphasize these things too, but they emphasize even more the things that the individual worker can do personally to help himself and his fellows. When obscene or antireligious conversation is rife in a certain factory, the workers face a real problem and one that interferes seriously with the integrity of working class life. It would obviously be absurd to talk of collective bargaining and social legislation as ways of removing such an evil. What should be done — and what the Jocistes actually do — is to fight the problem by personal action, by showing one's disgust at obscenity and by meeting irreligion by

intelligent argument. To a communist it would seem absurd to call immoral conversation in the factory a part of the labor problem, but to one who believes in religion it should be a natural viewpoint. The Jocistes would seem to be on the side of the angels.

In their personal action the Jocistes emphasize particularly the use of supernatural means. To Catholics such techniques should be logically inevitable, although little is said about them in our American publications. The real enemy of the workingman is not, after all, the selfish industrialist but the mystery of iniquity. His wrestling is not against flesh and blood but against the Principalities and the Powers. His sole hope of ultimate victory, then, lies in his use of supernatural weapons. This conclusion is so logical that it is hard to see how anyone could miss it. It is hard to understand the silence of the American Catholic labor literature on the subject. The Jocistes are by no means silent! Again and again they turn to the supernatural to find their most effective means of social action.

Often one can learn a great deal about the spirit of a movement by reading the lives of its heroes. These lives express in concrete detail the ideals which the members honor. Among the publications on the writer's desk are the biographies of three Jocistes whose acts were thought by the leaders of the movement to be worth recording. Charles Bouchard was *portier* at a hospital in Brussels. Raymond Delplancq worked in a shoe factory, on construction projects, in a glass works, at a foundry, and in other industries before becoming a professional *propagandiste* for the Jocistes. The subject of the third biography, identified only as "Mieke," was a young working girl who was employed in the manufacture of electric light bulbs and later at needlework. But the great contribution which each of these young people made, the thing which rendered them glorious in the eyes of the Jocistes, was to bear a long illness patiently and die of tuberculosis! From the supernatural viewpoint

it seemed that sufferings gladly borne and offered up for Jocism constituted a precious gift for the good of the cause. Patient agony is a powerful form of prayer; it wins divine grace, almost forces the hand of God. No wonder that the Jocistes, accustomed to the supernatural point of view, regarded these quiet sufferers as heroes in their movement.[2] This is a perfectly obvious Catholic way of thinking, but one fears it is a bit alien to our American mentality.

It is not surprising that a movement as supernatural in its orientation as Jocism should receive the enthusiastic commendation of the Holy See. Pope Pius XI saw in it "an authentic form of Catholic Action perfectly adapted to the present times."[3] He had the interests of the movement very much at heart, followed its development in detail, and read its literature regularly. His successor, the present Holy Father, has not been less interested. This is quite to be expected, for the Jociste attack on working class problems reflects the same uncompromising faith in the supernatural which is so prominent in the great encyclicals.

The comparison between Jocism on the one hand and the various American Catholic organizations interested in labor on the other should not be extended to details, for the purposes of the two movements here and abroad are somewhat different. The Jocistes are a Catholic Action group of young workers who aim at direct action. The American organizations are, for the most part, study and discussion groups not necessarily confined to the working class. Yet if the two movements cannot fairly be compared in detail, it does seem fair to compare their respective spirits. When this comparison is made, the point which stands out prominently is the contrast between the Jociste emphasis on the supernatural and the lack of emphasis in this country.

American writers on labor cannot be criticized for what they have done. They have considered the economic aspects of the labor problem in the light of sound ethics with fre-

quent reference to the ethical passages in the encyclicals. This is all to the good. But perhaps what they have left undone gives ground for criticism. Few American leaders have emphasized the supernatural and theological teaching on labor which the papal pronouncements contain. It would not seem unfair to say that discussions of the subject in this country are tinged with conformism. For conformism is the tendency to stress those views which Catholics can hold in common with non-Catholics and to say little about the Church's revealed doctrines which unbelievers cannot accept. Of course, silence on these points is not equivalent to denial. The American writers on labor do not arouse the slightest suspicion of dogmatic error. Yet their rather consistent silence on certain vital points can easily give rise to misunderstanding.

It is interesting to compare the writings of American Catholic authorities on labor with the writings of "liberals" of the New Deal type. The contrast is less striking than one would expect. In both cases there is a praiseworthy zeal for social justice. The Catholics implement their zeal with sound ethical arguments, but even the liberals are not entirely unfamiliar with good ethics. The Catholics quote those passages from the encyclicals which do not stress revelation. The liberals also have been known to quote the encyclicals on occasion, and besides they sometimes state in their own language ideas which are not altogether dissimilar. The Catholics give as their ultimate objective the reorganization of economic society in accordance with the occupational group idea. This does not shock the liberals too much, for the ill-starred National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 embodied tentative efforts in the same direction and had the liberals' benediction.

There is one test which ought to separate the two groups sharply, clearly, and unmistakably. Catholics should be distinguished for their constant emphasis on the supernatural aspects of the labor question, a point of view which

is naturally quite alien to liberal thought. It is therefore more than a little surprising to find so little about this phase of the subject in the writings of American Catholic authorities. Pope Leo XIII stated that the social question was primarily moral and religious.[4] If our Catholic writers in this country have given due emphasis to its moral aspects, they have certainly not had a great deal to say about its religious side. The same great pontiff asserted that it was vain to seek a remedy for the class struggle "in legislation, in the threat of penalties, or in the devices of human prudence," and went on to propose the Holy Eucharist as the efficacious remedy.[5] Reading our American Catholic writers on labor, one would scarcely guess that they had ever seen these words. For, although they put quite a good bit of stress on legislation and the other devices of human prudence, they seem to have forgotten that the Holy Eucharist is the great antidote for bad interclass relations. There is little in their writings which could offend the incredulity of their liberal friends.

Pick up any one of the encyclicals at random and you will probably find that it combines three orders of knowledge, truths gathered from observation, truths of philosophy, and revealed truths — at least you may be sure that the last of these three categories will not be lacking. When the Popes treat of labor, for example, they expound economic facts about the present situation and then discuss these facts in the light of both ethics and revelation. But when conformist writers discuss these same encyclicals their minds seem to act like a strainer. They strain out the supernatural to a disquieting degree. The Jocistes do not do this. Such would seem to be the fundamental reason for the difference of spirit between Jocism and the Catholic labor movement in this country.

The function of the Catholic Church is to carry on the redemptive work of Jesus Christ, to sanctify and save men through the Christian religion. The Church has no interest

in economics precisely as such any more than in mathematics or physical chemistry. It is only when economic matters impinge on her work of salvation that the Church becomes aroused. If, for example, workingmen are paid unjustly low wages, then she must be concerned; for the situation means sin for the employers and an occasion of sin for the employees. Under such circumstances the Church encourages the use of whatever natural or supernatural means seem appropriate to meet the problem. But always her point of view is supernatural. The salvation of souls is her concern. The natural becomes important only in so far as it touches on the supernatural.

The viewpoint of the liberals is completely different. The typical philosophy of the liberals is exclusively naturalistic. They are concerned with economic conditions because they see no further end of man beyond his happiness in this world. From a sentiment of natural sympathy they want the prosperity of the industrialist to be shared by the working class. The Church desires the workingman to enjoy a modest competence because abstract justice requires this and also because a certain freedom from worry about his daily bread gives the worker the mental leisure to think about his salvation. But to the mind of the Church the temporal prosperity of any class is never an end in itself. To the Catholic mind nothing really matters in the long run except eternal salvation.

Anyone who wishes to face the labor question in a thoroughly Catholic manner must bear these facts in mind. The supernatural is the touchstone by which all measures are to be tested. Even such an apparently mundane proposal as a social insurance law is good or bad according as in the long run it tends to help or hinder men in their quest of the beatific vision. The supreme purpose of a workingman's life is precisely the same as the supreme purpose of a nun's life — to love God and attain heaven. A

Catholic labor movement achieves its goal in the exact degree that it aids workers to fulfill this purpose.

A skeptical conformist might object that what has just been said confuses the role of the Catholic labor leader with the role of the parish priest. The parish, he might argue, has the responsibility for saving souls. In this holy work the parish is indeed aided by its societies and various purely religious groups. The function of a labor organization is more humble; it is in fact purely mundane. It operates in the economic sphere. By striving for social justice by natural means, it indeed aids religion indirectly; but its true function is primarily to help the workingman in his material needs. So the argument might run.

It is certainly true that the parish bears the chief responsibility for the spiritual welfare of the workingman along with all other classes of men. But the Church has never viewed with unconcern the separation of religion from any segment of life. The worker leads a particular kind of life with special problems of its own. The worker's distinctive way of living can be a road to heaven if it is Christianized after the pattern of the Carpenter of Nazareth. To make the life of the workingman holy, a number of tiny everyday adjustments must be made, and no one is as competent to discuss these details as the fervent Catholic worker himself. Then again, there are vast numbers of workingmen who never see a priest. Their Catholic associates who rub shoulders with them daily are the natural persons to evangelize them. It is therefore not surprising that the Holy See desires workers to Catholicize workers, and that Pope Pius XI praised those young workingmen "who lend a willing ear to the inspirations of divine grace and strive with wonderful zeal to win their fellows for Christ."[6]

The desire of the Holy See that religion should form an integral part of the labor movement is very clearly apparent

in the reiterated desire of the Popes that Catholic workingmen should belong to Catholic labor unions. It is true that sometimes "the laws of the country or peculiar economic conditions or that lamentable dissension of minds and hearts so prevalent in modern society and the urgent necessity of uniting our efforts and forces to combat the serried ranks of revolutionaries" may make it necessary for Catholics to join with non-Catholics in neutral trade-unions. It is the responsibility of the local bishops to judge when this is necessary. But under these conditions the Holy See prescribes that "side by side with these trade-unions there must always be associations which sedulously strive to train and form their members in religion and morals that these in turn may impart to their labor unions that upright spirit by which their entire conduct should be directed."[7]

It is unquestionably the mind of the Holy See that religion should be woven integrally into the fabric of the labor movement. This means that in our theoretical discussions labor questions should be viewed in the light of faith, just as they are in the encyclicals. It means also that practical efforts to aid the working class must include either Catholic trade-unions or else Catholic associations of workingmen paralleling the neutral unions to which they belong. It is only by thus bringing the supernatural to bear on labor problems that real progress can be made. The evils which infect our economic life are manifestations of the mystery of iniquity. When we oppose them we are not wrestling against flesh and blood but against the Principalities and the Powers. Such enemies are not to be overcome by the weak weapons of human prudence. A conformist labor movement is a weak and pitiable attempt to cope with gigantic forces of evil. Our hope of success does not lie in such flimsy makeshifts. Our hope lies in a frank and free application of supernatural principles and a frank and free use of supernatural means.

Chapter 9

SATAN INVADES THE HOME

IT IS a commonplace among sociologists that the modern American family is a rapidly changing institution. Careful studies have reported all manner of basic changes. Unfortunately, almost all these new developments seem to tend in one direction — away from the Christian family toward a pagan type of family life. Evidently the mystery of iniquity is very actively at work in this area. Here the Kingdom of Satan has won some surprising victories. It is a tragic situation.

Social thinkers of all schools have frequently remarked what a strategic position the family occupies in the structure of society; for home life touches the individual and influences his character in a very intimate manner. Long before the child is old enough to play his part in the life of the general community he has his role in the home. In the miniature society of the family he learns the give-and-take involved in living with others. There he acquires attitudes of selfishness or generosity which are likely to be persistent precisely because they come so early. There he develops a sense of values which later experience may be unable to modify. For better or for worse, the important process of education begins at home.

Sound family life is a most important stabilizing influence in society. A man can bear the vicissitudes of fortune more calmly if day by day he is comforted and strengthened by a wholesome, congenial home life. A woman — at least in old-fashioned families — may pass most of

her life in the home; she will be contented or dissatisfied according to the nature of her domestic surroundings. Old age is less a problem when the aged have their honored role to play in family life. There is abundant evidence to show that broken and abnormal homes are a prolific cause of juvenile delinquency. It is therefore easy to understand that whatever undermines the homes gnaws at the very roots of society.

The modern revolt against chastity is a basic cause of the breakdown of family life. The pleasures connected with sex belong to the order of natural good. In their due place, that is, within the consecrated life of Christian marriage, they can be a powerful stabilizing influence and a strong aid to conjugal charity. But when sex becomes an end in itself, when its pleasures are sought selfishly and without regard to the moral law, almost nothing can be so demoralizing. A false and distorted attitude toward sex is one of the saddest consequences of modern materialism.

It is well known that each generation tends to be shocked at the sins of the succeeding one. The old are ever inclined to be censorious toward the young — a statement which can be documented by quotations from almost any century. When we talk, therefore, about "the modern revolt against chastity," may we not be merely reflecting the attitude of a critical older generation? May we not be suffering from an illusion? One would like to think so, but unfortunately there are enough stubborn facts available to prove that standards of chastity are being lowered. Terman, for example, studied a group of married people believed to be "reasonably representative of the middle and upper-middle classes of urban and suburban California." He divided his subjects into four groups: those born before 1890, those born from 1890 to 1899, those born from 1900 to 1909, and those born in 1910 or later. Among the oldest group of women, 13.5 per cent admitted that they had not

been virgins at the time of marriage. The three successively younger groups gave percentages of 26.0, 48.8, and 68.3, in that order. In other words, over a period of some thirty years premarital incontinence showed a more than fivefold increase. The corresponding figures for the married men rose from 49.4 to 86.4 per cent, going from the oldest to the youngest group.[1]

Terman's study is particularly valuable because it shows the increase of unchastity from decade to decade among people of comparable socio-economic status. There are a number of other investigations which do not bring out this particular point, but which have some interest in the present connection because they show the prevalence of premarital unchastity in certain groups. Harvey summarizes a number of older studies made between 1915 and 1929; they show on the average that 35 per cent of the men and 15 per cent of the women studied were guilty of illicit intercourse before marriage.[2] More recent studies tend to show higher figures. Lynd and Lynd made a checkup of a small group of business-class persons in their twenties and found "seven out of every ten of them, evenly balanced as to sex, to have had sexual relations prior to marriage."[3] Bromley and Britten studied 1364 students from 46 colleges and universities and concluded, "Half of the men and one quarter of the women juniors and seniors in American colleges today have had premarital sex intercourse, if our survey furnishes a fair sampling of students of a median age of twenty."[4] With these figures it is interesting to compare Hamilton's figures on adultery. He studied 100 married men and 100 married women "well under forty years of age, residents of New York City, and classifiable as having attained a relatively high level of culture" and found that 59 per cent of the men and 47 per cent of the women were willing to admit this offense.[5] Of course, it is impossible to tell how well the subjects of these various

studies represented typical American behavior, but it is worth noting that they were far from being social outcasts; they were educated, cultured, "respectable" people.

Parallel with this breakdown of chastity as shown by conduct is a change of attitude — as indeed one would expect. The change can be followed by examining current literature and motion pictures. Hart has presented the results of a number of studies of this subject.[6] A study of passages in articles appearing in mass circulation magazines which indicated attitudes toward sex freedom (seduction, adultery, promiscuous "petting," exposure of the body, and so on) showed that in 1900 only 1 per cent of the expressions of attitude could be classified as "approving." By 1928 the figure had risen to 40 per cent, to sink to 14 per cent two years later. In magazine stories of 1900–05 the sexual irregularities of fictional characters were approved in only 3 per cent of the cases. The corresponding figure for the period 1931–32 had risen to 31 per cent in the intellectual magazines, 25 per cent in the mass circulation periodicals, 20 per cent in the women's magazines, while, strangely enough, it was only 16 per cent for magazines classified as "sensational." In the 1932 movies, 45 per cent of the sexual irregularities seemed to be approved. From 1905 to 1931 there was a rather constant rise in antagonism against religious sanctions for sex conduct. Neumann has noted a change in the character of the obstacles against which a fictional hero must struggle to win his heroine. In the older literature the obstacle was usually parental unwillingness, a villain, or the girl's unwillingness; in more recent literature there is often a triangle situation in which the hero is not always the husband.[7] Blanchard and Manasses questioned a group of girls and found that 55.0 per cent would not disapprove extramarital sex relationships among their girl friends; 30.6 per cent would definitely disapprove; the remainder were uncertain.[8]

Another attack on the integrity of family life in Amer-

ica has been the organized drive to popularize contraception, usually miscalled "birth control" or "planned parenthood" for propaganda purposes. This is a relatively new movement. The first contraceptive clinic in the world was opened in Amsterdam in 1878; the first in America was opened in New York by Margaret Sanger in 1917 — a legal offense for which she served thirty days in jail. The modern movement is exceedingly well organized and liberally financed.[9] It long ago won over the "liberals" and became quickly popular among the bourgeoisie. Of a thousand women questioned by Davis in her 1929 study, only 78 expressed disapproval of the use of contraceptives.[10] A very determined effort is now being made to popularize this sin among the poor and the uneducated. Abortion is a still more sinister practice. It is impossible to collect reliable statistics on this evil, for obvious reasons. Therefore it is necessary to fall back on estimates. Perhaps the most reliable of such estimates is that of Taussig, who set the number of abortions in the United States at 681,600 a year, most of them being induced by criminal operations.[11] This figure was equal to almost one third the number of live births per year in this country at the time Taussig's estimate was made.

Doubtless the practice of contraception has been a large factor in the decline of the birth rate in the United States, although it is difficult to guess its exact importance. In any case, the decline itself has been very serious. Accurate statistics for the United States are lacking for the earliest period, but estimates based on the best available data set the birth rate at more than 50 at the beginning of the nineteenth century.[12] By 1915 it had sunk to 25.1 in the Birth Registration Area, that is, in those states which collected accurate statistics on births. The rate fell to a low of 16.6 in 1933, then rose to 17.9 in 1940. After the outbreak of World War II there was a rapid increase; the figure for 1942 was 21.0, but there are indications that this increase

is to be temporary.[13] It is hazardous to draw conclusions from these figures, as many technical considerations enter in which cannot be discussed here. It does not seem rash to say, however, that it is at least possible in the light of current indications that the United States may be faced with a declining population not many generations hence. "Race suicide" would not seem to be an altogether inappropriate name for the generalized practice of contraception.

Divorce statistics also throw some light on the breakdown of the American family. The crude divorce rate (divorces per 1000 population) was 0.5 in 1887. By 1911 it had risen to 1.0. It then increased almost constantly to a new high of 2.0 in 1940.[14] Measures of the divorce trend which are more sensitive than these crude rates are known to sociologists, but they all tell the same story and so need not be brought into this discussion. Beyond a doubt the frequency of divorce has been increasing by leaps and bounds during the past half century. Parallel with this there has been a growing tolerance and then even a growing approval of the evil. A study of the attitude of heroes and heroines toward divorce in the movies of 1931–32 showed that expressions of approval were about eleven times as frequent as expressions of disapproval.[15]

Along with the breakdown of family life there has been a growing tendency for women to seek employment outside the home. In the United States in 1870 only about one worker in seven was a woman. In 1940 the proportion had risen to about one in four. At present, under wartime conditions, it is approaching one in three. Expressed in absolute numbers, there has been an increase of women workers from 1.8 million in 1870 to 17.7 million in July, 1943, the latest date for which statistics are available.[16] Especially significant is the increased employment of women in the manufacturing industries since the outbreak of the war. In the past four years the number of women so employed has about doubled.[17] If the large-scale employment

of women is a temporary condition due to disappear after the war, then it is not so serious. Some observers, however, fear that the condition is likely to persist even in time of peace.

To say that woman's place is in the home is considered definitely old-fashioned, but the papal statements on the matter are rather definite. For unmarried women a moderate amount of work in carefully chosen occupations is not open to serious objection; but "certain occupations are little suited to women who are intended by nature to work in the home — work indeed which especially protects woman's dignity and naturally promotes the training of the children and the well-being of the family."[18] Married women, particularly those with children, should not be forced to seek outside employment. "Let married women especially carry on their work at home or in the immediate vicinity, concentrating on household duties."[19]

The result of the change in the status of women has been a decrease in modesty and a tendency to ape the ways of men. "One could see," said Pope Benedict XV, "that women trained without religion lay aside their modesty along with their piety, while not a few of them, devoting themselves too much to pursuits alien to their nature, acquire an utterly masculine way of acting."[20] The way many women dress is in itself enough to indicate their lack of modesty and their desire to imitate men. One might raise the question whether the enlistment of women in the armed services is not another sign of their defeminization. Pope Pius XI deplored the fact that "excesses are often committed in giving a militaristic turn to the so-called physical education of boys — and sometimes even of girls, in contradiction to the very dictates of human nature" (*contro la natura stessa delle cose umane*).[21] If the Holy Father felt that even the tendency toward militarism in girls' physical education was somehow unnatural, one may wonder what the Catholic attitude should be toward the WAC and WAVES, whose

members form part of the armed forces, train and drill like soldiers, and wear military and naval uniforms.

It is clear from the facts presented that the modern world has revolted against chastity and that this revolt has involved the gradual breakdown of family life and the degradation of womanhood. Objective evidence shows that these evils have been growing in recent decades at an accelerated rate. The remedy, obviously enough, is a return to the Catholic conception of marriage as a sacrament, a supernatural ideal of unspeakable beauty which holds within itself the remedy for all the modern problems which affect family life. Catholics have a great responsibility. It is their duty by word and example to lead the return to chaste and wholesome wedlock. Unfortunately Catholics have not always been conscious of this duty. Even among them false ideas have made some headway. We have the authority of Pope Pius XI for this statement. For, speaking of modern aberrations in regard to marriage, he stated that "these most pernicious errors and depraved morals have begun to spread even amongst the faithful and are gradually gaining ground."[22]

The sad truth seems to be that the spirit of conformism is at work in this field as it is elsewhere. Catholics live in a world in which sexual sins are shamelessly flaunted and sound ideals of marriage are constantly ridiculed. They meet these errors everywhere, in books, in magazines and newspapers, in the movies, in the conversation of their friends. It requires an unusually strong faith and a determined character to be exposed to these temptations without being at all affected by them. The urge to conform to current standards overwhelms the weak. As a result the dress of Christian women often differs little from the dress of their pagan friends. Under the influence of passion Catholics enter into mixed marriages or into unions which cannot claim the name of marriage at all. It is not exclusively

pagan women who ape the manners of men. The modern revolt against chastity has not left Catholics untouched.

Birth rates are an important index of family vitality. If a given group is characterized by a low birth rate, then within that group marriages are late or few, contraception is being practised, or some other factor is at work whose significance for family life is sinister. It is therefore interesting to compare the birth rates of Catholics and non-Catholics respectively. Unfortunately the data available on this point are not as adequate as one might wish. The latest and most elaborate study relevant in this connection is the Indianapolis Household Survey based on 41,498 native-white couples in that city.[23] Results were expressed in terms of *fertility rates*. This term means, in the language of the study, the "total number of children ever born per 100 wives 15–44 years of age," certain adjustments being made to allow for differences of age distribution. The fertility rate for purely Catholic marriages was 173; for purely Protestant marriages, 147; for Protestant-Catholic mixed marriages, 133.

At first glance these statistics seem very encouraging. A closer analysis, however, reveals certain disturbing features. First of all, the fertility rate for the purely Catholic marriages, though higher than the others, was not high in itself. It was in fact barely large enough to maintain a stationary population. It was high only in a relative sense, by comparison with the others. Again, the number of mixed marriages was large; there were more than half as many mixed as purely Catholic marriages in the group. Note that the fertility of these mixed marriages was extraordinarily low. Finally, the superiority of the Catholic fertility rate over the non-Catholic seemed to be due to the large families of the older Catholic mothers. The younger Catholic wives did not have many more children than Protestants of corresponding ages. This might mean that non-Catholic women tend to renounce childbearing after the first few years of

married life while Catholics continue; or it might mean that the younger generation of Catholic wives is becoming infertile like the non-Catholics. It is noteworthy, in connection with this second hypothesis, that a group of older studies summarized by Mulvaney[24] tend to show that, while the Catholic birth rate remains higher than the non-Catholic, both have been declining. Mulvaney has recently stated: "Many sample studies indicate that in the twenties, Catholics had a relatively high fertility. . . . By 1930, however, the relatively high Catholic fertility was not easy to measure."[25]

If the Catholic birth rate has been decreasing, at least some of the blame must be assigned to the recent popularity of the so-called "safe period" or "rhythm" method of "natural birth control." This method rests on the principle, apparently rather well established, that during a certain part of the woman's monthly cycle intercourse cannot be followed by conception. There are certain practical difficulties in the application of the method; but it does seem to be true that by keeping a watchful eye on the calendar married people can avoid having children in all, or almost all, cases. What is to be thought of the morality of this practice? The existing Roman documents do not give a clear answer covering all possible cases, and theologians do not all agree in their discussion of the matter. Obviously enough, the mere temporary abstention from the marriage act is not sinful when both spouses agree from upright motives and there is no resulting danger of incontinence. Even systematic abstention during each of the recurring periods when conception is possible — in other words, the practice of the "rhythm" method — can be allowed for certain legitimate reasons; Rome has said that it may be "cautiously" counseled by confessors as an alternative to dissuade penitents "from the detestable crime of onanism."[26] On the other hand, the use of this method to avoid the responsibilities of parenthood for frivolous or selfish motives is certainly not

in accordance with the highest ideals of Christian marriage. Indiscriminate propaganda in favor of this method of family limitation can do a great deal of harm.

It is, of course, impossible to say to what extent exactly the abuse of the "rhythm" method has lowered the Catholic birth rate and injured the integrity of the Catholic home. There is reason to believe that the method is very popular. An inexpensive book written to introduce Catholics to the practice bears on its dust wrapper the words "200th thousand."[27] Perhaps these figures ought not to be taken too seriously since they have appeared unchanged on several successive reprintings. But the book has undoubtedly been enormously popular. Doubtless it was written with the most upright intentions; yet it has probably done a great deal of harm. Its sanctimonious tone is calculated to lull the consciences of the unwary and it certainly does not stress the disadvantages of indiscriminate family limitation. The tone of the book may be gathered from the following statement quoted on the authority of a priest, "The limiting of families by that natural method is good, moral, meritorous (*sic*) action, when there is the least reason for it."[28] One may wonder whether the theology of this statement is much sounder than its grammar and spelling.

If married people, Catholic and non-Catholic, are reluctant to bring children into the world, the blame does not belong exclusively to them. Partly our evil economic system is responsible. As Pope Pius XI said, "The perfect observance of God's commands and conjugal integrity encounter difficulties by reason of the fact that the man and wife are in straitened circumstances."[29] Where parents are forced to live in extreme poverty, the temptation to forego children can be very great. Extra children mean more mouths to feed and parents know that these children will have to face a life of misery and want in unhealthy slums where vice is rampant. Mothers who are reluctantly forced to seek employment merely to get the necessities of life for their

families may be pardoned if they hesitate to bring additional children into the world. In the white-collar class the selfishness of parents may be responsible for the limitation of offspring, but when the poor limit their families the selfishness of society must bear most of the blame. All praise, then, to those brave Christian mothers of the poor who reject the insidious suggestions of the "birth controllers" and manage by hard work and sacrifice to raise healthy and virtuous children in spite of the most disheartening obstacles!

If the family is to be restored to its former glory, not only married Catholics but all Catholics must do their part. All must work for the reformation of an economic system which places crushing burdens on the poor. In the meantime, before this needed reform is accomplished, private charity should provide the poor with sufficient means to raise their families in decency, or if "private resources do not suffice, it is the duty of public authority to supply for the insufficient forces of individual effort, particularly in a matter which is of such importance to the common weal."[30] But, while we should remove the economic obstacles to wholesome family life by private maternity guilds or public assistance, we must not forget that the deepest cause for the breakdown of family life is the modern materialistic spirit itself. Economic measures alone are not enough to rehabilitate family life. Here again our wrestling is not against flesh and blood but against the mystery of iniquity. Against this enemy nothing will be effective but a wholehearted return to the supernatural.

Chapter 10

CONFORMISM AND RACE

OUR attitude toward men of other races is a crucial test of our Catholicity. The great law of charity requires us to love all men, regardless of race, with an intense love. There are no exceptions to this law. It is absolutely universal in its application. Whoever fails to love his neighbor proves by that very fact that he does not love God; he has failed to practice the most fundamental of all Christian virtues. "If anyone says, 'I love God,' and hates his brother, he is a liar," says plain-spoken St. John.[1]

Worldly men follow quite another standard. The principle on which they act is, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and shalt hate thy enemy."[2] In the eyes of the worldly man it is a virtue to love his friends, his wife, and children, and all those who belong to his own set. That appears just and reasonable to him. But to love one's enemies seems to him almost a contradiction in terms. In his eyes it is ridiculous to be asked to love even those toward whom he feels no natural attraction and even those who positively offend him.

Charity, therefore, is a virtue which sharply differentiates the genuine Christian from the worldling. It is important to note in this connection that the Christian proves his charity only when he loves those whom he is not naturally inclined to love. To love one's friends is no proof. Our Lord Himself called attention to this fact. "If you love those who love you, what reward shall you have? Do not even the publicans do that? And if you salute your brethren only, what are you doing more than others? Do not even the

Gentiles do that?"[3] Unbelievers can be loyal to their friends; if a Catholic does the same thing he is doing nothing special or distinctive. It is only by exhibiting a type of love which worldlings cannot hope to imitate that a man shows himself to be a true follower of Christ.

The interracial test is an excellent test of charity. Christ Himself made this point in the story of the Good Samaritan. To appreciate the significance of this parable it is important to examine the circumstances which called it forth. A Jewish lawyer, that is, a man learned in the Mosaic Law, asked our Lord what he needed to do to gain eternal life. "What is written in the Law?" answered our Lord, "How dost thou read?"[4] The lawyer replied quite correctly by quoting the law of charity which includes the obligation of loving one's neighbor as oneself. Christ replied that the answer was perfectly correct, by charity one gains eternal life. The lawyer, however, was still unsatisfied, so he put the further question, "And who is my neighbor?"[5] This was indeed a crucial point. The Jews were well aware of the obligation of loving their neighbors; but what, precisely, did the term "neighbor" imply? Did it refer only to one's relatives, friends, and acquaintances, or perhaps to all one's fellow Jews? Could it by any chance include even strangers? In any case, the lawyer probably thought, it could not refer to enemies or to heretics and men of different racial background like, for example, the Samaritans.

Christ proceeded to clear up all these doubts by telling the story of the Good Samaritan. The point of the parable is that whereas both a priest and a Levite passed by the wounded man as he lay by the roadside without helping him, the Samaritan, a member of a race which the Jews despised, rose to the occasion and showed by his action what it meant to love one's neighbor. The hero of the parable, then, answered the lawyer's question by practicing charity across racial lines. To gain eternal life, a man must love God above all things and his neighbor as himself. The

term "neighbor" means not just one's friends and the men of one's own group but even men of other races. This is the way to gain heaven. If the questioning lawyer was sincere, let him imitate the Good Samaritan. "Go and do thou also in like manner."[6]

In the strict, technical sense of the physical anthropologist, the Samaritans were perhaps not racially distinct from the Jews. They were, however, a hybrid group of very mixed blood. Many centuries before the time of Christ, Samaria had been the capital of the Kingdom of Israel. After it had fallen before the Assyrian hosts in 722 B.C., Sargon had deported the leading citizens and replaced them by "people from Babylon, and from Cutha, and from Avah, and from Emath, and from Sepharvaim."[7] The newcomers soon intermarried with the Samaritans who had not been deported. The resulting crossbreeds lived on very unfriendly terms with the pure-blooded Jews of Judah and Galilee. By the time of Christ this animosity had hardened into a traditional hatred. The two groups did not mix. "Jews do not associate with Samaritans."[8] Whether the Samaritans were racially distinct in the technical sense or not, the Jews certainly showed toward them the typical characteristics of interracial hatred. For the present purpose that is the important point.

The parallel between interracial hatred in first-century Palestine and in twentieth-century America is obvious and striking. "Jews do not associate with Samaritans" — how much that sounds like "White people do not associate with Negroes"! A good many Catholics living in the United States need to study the lesson that Christ taught the Jewish lawyer. "What must we do to gain eternal life?" We must love God and love our neighbor. "And who is our neighbor?" The answer might well be given by translating the parable of the Good Samaritan into American terms. That would give us the parable of the Good Negro. A white man stood in desperate need of immediate assistance. Two

professed Catholics — a priest and a seminarian perhaps — saw him and did nothing. Then a Negro came along and helped the man generously. The Negro is the hero of the parable because his charity was not limited by racial lines. Do we want to get to heaven? Very well, then, let us go and do also in like manner. The lesson is quite unequivocal, is it not?

We must go and do also in like manner. Otherwise we shall not gain eternal life. Hell will be our portion. The obligation of showing our love for men of other races is evidently a very serious obligation. It is a matter of eternal life and death. It would be well, then, for us native-born white American Catholics to examine our consciences with the utmost seriousness. How do we act toward the other racial or quasi-racial groups who live among us? How do we treat the Jew, the Oriental, the Mexican, the Indian, the Negro? The question is complex because race prejudice creates separate and characteristic problems in the case of each of these groups. The present chapter will discuss Negro-white relationships principally, since these constitute a peculiarly American problem and since the Negro population of the country makes up by far the largest of the minority groups.

Consider, first of all, the economic plight of the Negro. In general, white workers are given the more desirable jobs as a matter of course. It is very difficult for the Negro even to secure the training necessary to prepare himself for well-paid employment. If, through an almost superhuman effort, he does succeed in preparing himself for such a position, he still finds that good jobs are closed to him. As a result, it is exceedingly difficult for Negroes, even with thrift and hard work, to maintain a family at the economic level of common decency. Recently Sterner has published an exhaustive study on the subject.[9] The facts are very difficult to summarize because they are so complex, but one generalization may be made with confidence. Wherever the economic situa-

tion of comparable groups of Negroes and whites may be fairly compared, the Negroes are almost uniformly found to be not only worse off but very much worse off.

Among the facts which Sterner has brought together, some of the most significant are those dealing with the adequacy of Negro family earnings to maintain the family at the subsistence level. In 1935 the Works Progress Administration made a number of careful studies of the actual cost in various cities for maintaining a manual worker's family consisting of the parents and two children under 16. On this basis an "emergency" budget was worked out which would maintain a family temporarily under depression conditions, although it might create health hazards if it were continued for any considerable period of time. In Mobile, Ala., for example, this budget amounted to $815; in Columbus, Ohio, where the cost of living was a little higher, it was $841. This is obviously pretty low, but with care and economy, according to the WPA, it was just possible to get along precariously with such a budget. With these budget figures Sterner compares the available data on family income in the same cities during the same period. The results are shocking. Excluding the families receiving relief (who were presumably in a still more sorry plight), only 16.3 per cent of the Negro families of two children and two adults were above the budget minimum in Mobile as against 72.6 per cent of the white families. For Columbus, the figures were 32.6 per cent for Negroes and 79.4 per cent for whites. These figures, remember, were not gathered during the darkest days of the depression but during a time of moderate prosperity. The statistics for white families are bad enough, but for the Negro families they are appalling. In a typical southern city apparently five sixths of the Negroes were facing slow starvation; in a typical northern city, two thirds. It is a situation which should fill one with horror.

Here is a very concrete and practical test of the quality

of our interracial charity. Can we be said to love the Negro if we see him in extreme distress and pass by? "He who has the goods of this world," says St. John, "and sees his brother in need and closes his heart to him, how does the love of God abide in him?"[10] The priest and the Levite who passed by the wounded man on Jericho Road probably pitied him in his plight, but they were too much preoccupied with their duties, presumably, to stop and help him. Perhaps they even resolved to pray for the poor fellow's soul. That was commendable enough, but the duty of the moment was to help him in his physical distress and they neglected that duty. Perhaps you, reader, have a general sympathy for the Negro's distress, but the test question is, "What, concretely, are you doing about it?" Are you spending money on yourself which you do not actually need while the Negro starves? St. John the Baptist had some very good advice, "Let him who has two tunics share with him who has none; and let him who has food do likewise."[11] Practical advice, is it not?

The housing problem is a particularly galling one for the underprivileged Negro worker. Fortunately the Federal Government has become aroused over the situation and has appropriated funds for some low-cost housing units for both white and Negro occupancy. The provision of housing for Negroes, however, has not proceeded without opposition. In June, 1941, it was announced that 700 units would be built in a certain congested industrial city, of which 200 would be for colored residents. Because the Negro housing units were being erected in a mixed colored and white neighborhood, the project met bitter opposition from intolerant whites. After all legal means had been exhausted, the opposition culminated in mob violence on February 28, 1942, the day on which the Negro residents were to move in. The incident attracted national and even international attention, for Japanese radio propagandists used it to persuade the colored peoples of the Far East what sort of

treatment they might expect from white America. It is unpleasant to add that a Catholic priest was one of the leaders of the opposition.

Discrimination against the Negro often takes the form of segregation. If segregation meant that the Negro was given facilities separate from those available to whites but equal in quality, then the system would still be insulting to the Negro but it would be much less objectionable than it actually is. As a matter of sober fact, however, segregation almost in every case implies unequal treatment. Take medical care, for example. The Negro student finds it difficult or impossible to enter the best medical schools. Nurses face the same situation. A Catholic high school girl in Chicago wrote at her pastor's suggestion to all the local Catholic hospitals maintaining nursing schools stating that she was colored and that she wanted to become a nurse; not one of them had the courtesy to reply.[12] White hospitals often exclude colored patients altogether. The results of this policy can be very tragic. When Juliette Derricotte, a widely known Negro leader, was injured in an automobile accident near the town of Dalton, Georgia, in November, 1931, the local hospital refused to treat her. Against the advice of the attending physician she was sent in an ambulance over a rough road to a colored hospital in Chattanooga, Tennessee. She died twenty-six hours after the accident.[13] It is hard to measure in absolute terms the quality of the medical care which Negroes receive in this country, but the available evidence seems to make it certain that they are gravely handicapped in this regard.

Particularly galling to the Negro is the denial of civil rights. In a democracy one of the most fundamental rights of the citizen is the ballot. After the Civil War the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution was passed to guarantee the Negro this right. Its wording seems clear enough: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State

on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." Yet in large sections of the country Negroes are actually denied the ballot by various subterfuges which need not be discussed here. Dollard, after studying Negro-white relationships in a southern town, declared that to live there for a while was a liberal education in the value of the ballot.[14] Then there is the question of the Negro before the court. Over the door of the Supreme Court building in Washington is the inscription, "Equal justice under law." A worthy sentiment surely and one which ought to characterize the administration of justice in a democracy. But it means little to the Negro in this country. Very generally the Negro is excluded, partially or completely, from the police force, from the practice of law, from jury duty, and from the bench. By and large the colored offender is dealt with by law made and enforced by white men. In view of the existence of prejudice it is not surprising that he receives unfair treatment. According to McCord's figures, the Negro criminal receives on the average a sentence one third longer than the white criminal convicted of the same offense.[15] A student of the present writer, Dorothy M. Bowen, compared the treatment of white and Negro housebreakers in the District of Columbia in 1934 and found discrimination against the latter group at every point.[16] The crime of lynching is more sensational, but in the long run the injustice of law enforcement agencies is even more galling to the Negro.

Americans are justly proud of their fine educational system with its public, private, and parochial schools. It *is* a fine system — but not for the Negro. In many states with large colored populations Negroes are segregated in separate schools. When this happens the Negro schools are usually strikingly inferior. Statistics for ten states for the school year 1935–36 show an average annual expenditure of $17.04 per Negro pupil as compared with $49.30 per white pupil.[17] It is sad to be forced to admit that such

discrimination often extends to Catholic schools. In view of the extreme importance of Catholic education, it is tragic that Negro children should sometimes be excluded from parochial schools, especially when no Negro parochial schools are available in the area. The situation in Catholic colleges is gradually improving but even now there are colleges which exclude colored students. This situation causes more than a little scandal. Recently a Catholic women's college refused a Negro applicant. Immediately a feature article appeared on the front page of a widely circulated Negro newspaper with a letter asking the college authorities how their action could be reconciled with the ideals of the Church. The letter was couched in most respectful language, but it made its point. Thus the intolerance of the college was advertised far and wide. Such incidents do not aid in the conversion of the American Negro, a cause to which many priests and nuns have generously dedicated their lives.

Sometimes college authorities allege as an excuse that if colored students were admitted, many white students would leave. This is not a fact, as is shown by the experience of those colleges which have boldly admitted Negroes. But even if it were a fact, why should colleges regret the loss of students so prejudiced that they would leave an institution admitting colored applicants? Any college president who discovered a sexual pervert in the student body would expel him at once without hesitation. He would rid the place of such an individual as a corrupting influence on the other students. Race prejudice is a vice also. Some Catholic schools and colleges exclude Negroes in obedience to a state law. Such a law must unfortunately be obeyed, but the attitude of the Catholic educational authorities cannot be commended unless they are doing all they can to have the law repealed at the same time as they obey it.

There is a broad and miscellaneous category of anti-Negro discrimination which can be best described as social.

This includes segregation in public conveyances and places of amusement, the exclusion of the Negro from certain hotels and restaurants, restrictions in the use of public parks and beaches, and residential segregation. It includes, in certain places, the withholding of titles of courtesy such as "Mr." and "Mrs." and the custom of requiring Negroes to use the back door when calling at the houses of white people.[18] Upon hasty consideration these customs might not seem to be seriously wrong, for they appear at most merely to insult the Negro and not really to injure him. Actually their effect is much more sinister. For these apparently minor customs mark Negroes out as a class apart, a class not to be treated in precisely the same way as white persons. When this attitude is sanctioned by a hundred minor usages, it becomes ingrained in the consciousness of the citizens. It is human nature to extend this attitude to all areas of social relationships. If withholding the title "Mr." is to stamp the Negro as an inferior citizen, then he is not likely to be paid the same wage as a white man or to receive the same treatment in court. Interracial etiquette tends to "keep the Negro in his place," and "his place" (in this sense) seldom proves to be that which abstract justice and charity would assign him.

There is one form of discrimination which the Negro meets which is delicate to discuss but which, nevertheless, cannot very well be omitted in a realistic survey. That is the treatment which the Negro receives from Catholics in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament. A priest friend of mine, the pastor of a large Negro parish, once sadly remarked to me, "I spend about half my time trying to undo the harm which my brother priests have caused." No one who knows the situation will think that this statement was much exaggerated. One common form of discrimination is to segregate Negroes in a few back pews when they come to a white church. Another priest friend of mine was once instructing a

prospective convert. The man was a highly educated Negro; he was, in fact, a college professor. He was thrilled as the priest unfolded to him the great and beautiful doctrine of charity and particularly when the priest explained to him the Sacrifice of the Mass, the great source of charity. One Sunday the Negro determined to attend Mass, so he wandered into a Catholic church and took a seat in a pew in the middle of the church. He was lost in prayer when suddenly he felt someone touch his shoulder and looked up to see an usher standing there. "Niggers have to sit in the back pews," said the usher. The Negro rose quietly and left the church; he has never been inside a Catholic church from that day to this. It is easy to say that he should have distinguished between the holiness of the Church and the un-Catholic attitude of an individual; but remember, this man was only an inquirer, not a fully instructed Catholic. His error, one may be sure, was pardonable.

The basic reason why Negroes suffer these irritating forms of discrimination on the part of many Catholics is that the Catholics themselves are unfaithful to their own principles. It is the old evil of conformism. The typical American attitude toward the colored population involves injustice and discrimination; and most Catholics have tended to swim with the tide. Murphy, studying the attitudes of American Catholics toward the Negro during the century 1825–1925, concluded, "As members of the dominant racial group, Catholics seem to have shared in the general attitude which dominant groups have toward minorities."[19] Of course, this does not mean that all Catholics were anti-Negro; it means that favorable and unfavorable attitudes were mixed within the Catholic group in much the same proportions as they were among outsiders. A study of the period since 1925 when Murphy's study ended would probably show an improvement in race relations, proceeding at approximately the same rate among both Catholics and non-Catholics. Whatever difference there is, or has been,

between the racial attitudes of the two groups is certainly not particularly striking.

Conformism is the tendency to compromise by adapting oneself to the position of unbelievers as far as it is possible to do so without positively denying any dogma of faith. This conformism is brilliantly illustrated in the attitude of many Catholics toward the Negro. They do not deny the duty of loving the Negro; that would be to deny a basic Catholic doctrine, the duty of loving all men. But when an occasion arises to show their love of the Negro in some practical way, they always manage to find some sort of an excuse. "The time is not ripe," they say, or, "It would not be prudent," or, "We must move slowly." No matter how obvious an evil may be, Catholic conformism can always rise to the occasion with a sophistical argument to prove that it is the duty of Catholics to do nothing effective about it.

Conformism is basically dishonest. It refuses to face the fact that there is an utter contradiction between supernatural charity and the philosophy of worldliness. Charity demands that we see Christ in all men and therefore love all men with an intense love. Worldliness, basically selfish, is the contradiction of disinterested love. In our treatment of the Negro we must take on one attitude or the other. We must be worldlings or Christians. There is not the slightest possibility of finding a middle ground.

It is not what we say, but what we do, that shows whether we are worldlings or Christians. Again and again occasions arise which force the choice upon us. Shall we do the Christian thing and perhaps stir up a lot of trouble for ourselves, or shall we avoid trouble and do the worldly thing even though it is against Catholic principles? Over and over again the problem arises. It arises in regard to the admission of Negroes to Catholic colleges and the seating arrangement of Negroes in church. It arises in our social relationships. Am I willing to concede to a colored stranger

the same minor courtesies which I show to a white stranger, and to a colored acquaintance the same courtesies as to a white acquaintance? It arises in regard to our willingness to fight in public against concrete instances of economic and political discrimination. These repeated tests very soon reveal the quality of a man's interracial charity; and interracial charity, you remember, is the proof that a man really does love his neighbor as himself. The parable of the Good Samaritan showed that.

While it is a cowardly vice to conform to current worldly standards of interracial injustice and uncharity, it is, on the other hand, a particularly brave virtue to break sharply with these abominable standards and practice Christian charity in the face of criticism. Those Catholic colleges — and their number is increasing day by day — who throw their doors wide open to colored students have gained increased respect, not only among Negroes, but also among decent white people. Those pastors who have refused to countenance segregation in their churches and parochial schools have found no reason to regret their action. A number of Catholic organizations have disdained to confine themselves to harmless generalities, but have gone on record against specific interracial abuses and have set a brave example to others. High ecclesiastical dignitaries have been attacking racial injustice with increasing severity. Above all, a noble army of priests and religious have devoted themselves to the service of the Negro. There can be few greater proofs of interracial love than this: to practice the evangelical virtues for the salvation of men of another race. All these developments are in line with the many strong pronouncements against racism which have emanated from the Holy See.[20]

These zealous prelates, priests, religious, and lay people are setting an inspiring example for other Catholics. The spirit which they have shown is the spirit which should animate every follower of Christ. Love for the Negro, the

Jew, the Oriental, and for the members of other minority groups is not a special virtue to be practiced by a few. It is simply an application of the Christian charity which is a duty for all. It is the obligation of all who would gain eternal life. It is a strict responsibility of every Catholic to rid himself of the least vestige of that cowardly spirit of conformism which takes its inspiration from the world and not from the Gospel. Until the average Catholic can learn to treat men of other races with justice and Christian love, the progress of the Church in America will be gravely handicapped.

Chapter 11

EXAGGERATED NATIONALISM

MANY recent papal statements have called attention to the menace of exaggerated nationalism. To appreciate the import of these pronouncements, it is above all necessary to distinguish clearly between this vice and the virtue of patriotism. The two have a certain very superficial similarity in that they both imply some sort of enthusiasm toward one's country. This similarity is not very deep. It should confuse no one. Yet it does, as a matter of fact, confuse some unthinking Catholics. Hence the necessity of emphasizing the distinction.

In a word the distinction is this: Patriotism is a love of country which is regulated by the law of God. Exaggerated nationalism is a love which oversteps the bounds set by divine law, putting loyalty to country above loyalty to the Almighty. Love is an overwhelming passion which needs to be regulated by moral considerations. This is true of affection toward one's native land just as it is true of affection between the sexes. A man's love for a woman can be a most ennobling influence as long as it is in accordance with the moral law. Especially when it is sanctified by Christian marriage it can be a motive for great virtue. But this same passion, when it becomes perverse and unregulated, can be the occasion of disgusting vices and can demoralize a man utterly. In a parallel way love of country can rise to the heights of heroic virtue or sink to the depths of degrading sin.

In studying the papal thought on patriotism one must

take into consideration the fact that most Roman documents are written in a very pure classical Latin and that there is no simple and exact equivalent of the English word *patriotism* in the classical Latin vocabulary. The Popes therefore use such expressions as *patriae amor* ("love of country"),[1] *erga patriam fidelitas* ("fidelity to country"),[2] *patriae,* or *in patriam studium* ("devotion to country"),[3] or *patriae caritas* ("supernatural love of country").[4] The last of these equivalents is the most revealing. Patriotism is a supernatural love (*caritas,* charity) directed toward one's country. All Catholics are indeed bound to love with the love of charity all men including both their own personal enemies and the enemies of their country. But in the practice of charity a certain order is to be observed. Other things being equal, we must love with a more intense charity those who are closest to us. The old saying, "Charity begins at home," has a sound theological basis. In accordance with this principle there is a special obligation of loving particularly the citizens of our own country. This special duty of love is the basis of patriotism.

Since patriotism is a species of charity, it is readily seen what a sublime virtue it is; for charity is the queen of the virtues. It is not a merely human affection. It is a divine love, similar in kind, though of course not in intensity, to the love which binds together the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity. As long as patriotism remains supernatural, it is difficult to exaggerate its sublime beauty. Every act motivated by this virtue is truly meritorious. Furthermore, since charity is the supreme duty of the Christian, the Catholic has an extraordinarily powerful motive for acting the part of a true patriot. From the very nature of the case the Church is bound to approve and encourage patriotism in all her children.

Very different from true patriotism is exaggerated nationalism (*immoderatus nationis amor,*[5] *un nazionalismo quanto esagerato e falso,*[6] *un egoistico e duro nazionalismo*).[7]

Over and over again this vice is condemned by the Popes — not, of course, because it is nationalism, but because it is exaggerated. Properly understood, nationalism is not wrong, for it implies love of nation and this love comes to about the same thing as patriotism.[8] But when nationalism is so exaggerated that it is placed above the moral law, then it becomes a very evil and pernicious force. This is the attitude summed up in the fatuous slogan, "My country right or wrong." A man who uses those words accepts the national will as a principle of conduct regardless of its morality. He professes himself ready for any crime so long as his country demands it. Obviously this attitude leaves no room for ethics and religion; for ethics and religion have been supplanted by the State. What the State wills, not what God wills, is to determine how the individual shall act. Exaggerated nationalism is the worst charge that can be made against Hitler's Germany; for all Nazi crimes can be quite logically justified, once this pernicious principle has been admitted.

The Popes are very careful to distinguish between legitimate patriotism and exaggerated nationalism as they point out the many evils which flow from the latter. It is impossible in the space available here to attempt to summarize the many papal pronouncements on the subject.[9] Two statements of Pope Pius XI, however, must be cited because they express the mind of the Holy See with particular clarity. The first points out that exaggerated nationalism is the sort of pseudo patriotism which causes wars. "And certainly it is from these unbridled lusts — masquerading, of course, as public spirit and patriotism — that international enmities and conflicts are wont to arise. For this patriotism and national loyalty, though a potent spur to many virtues and brave deeds as long as it is guided by the law of Christ, becomes nevertheless the seed of widespread wrongs and evils when it oversteps the bounds of justice and right and grows into an excessive nationalism."[10]

The other quotation points out how the spirit of nationalism can so deaden the conscience that wrong is looked on as right by a strange and tragic inversion of moral values. "Right order of Christian charity does not disapprove of lawful love of country and a sentiment of justifiable nationalism; on the contrary it controls, sanctifies, and enlivens them. If, however, egoism, abusing this love of country and exaggerating this sentiment of nationalism, insinuates itself into the relations between people and people, there is no excess which will not seem justified; and that which between individuals would be judged blameworthy by all is now considered lawful and praiseworthy if it is done in the name of this exaggerated nationalism."[11]

Because exaggerated nationalism discards God's law and sets up the national will as the ultimate norm of its perverse morality, it is obviously a very anti-Catholic force. This is not only evident theoretically; it is evident also from the history of nationalism.[12] The whole story is much too long to be reviewed here, yet a few points are worth noting. In the Middle Ages nations in the modern sense did not exist. The civic loyalty of each man was centered on his immediate superior within the complicated framework of the feudal system. Beyond that, men felt a rather vague civic obligation toward Christendom in general. Ambitious rulers did indeed quarrel with the Papacy on political issues, but the supremacy of the Pope as the arbiter of moral issues was hardly seriously challenged. Toward the end of the thirteenth century, however, medieval culture showed signs of breaking down and at the same time the spirit of nationalism began to develop in western Europe. From the first it betrayed its hostility to the Church. In theory this need not have been the case; loyalty to a nation does not necessarily imply disloyalty to the Pope; but as a matter of historical fact the new nations were jealous of the Church's hold over the consciences of men. This tendency is clearly visible, for example, in the controversy between Philip the Fair, King

of France, and Pope Boniface VIII. The writings of Pierre du Bois who defended Philip are tinged with a strangely modern nationalism.

In the sixteenth century nationalism had become strongly intrenched, and it certainly played a most important role in the Protestant revolt against Rome. If the influence of nationalism is left out of account the Reformation cannot possibly be explained. The classical Protestant interpretation of the movement as a popular revolt against the corruption of the Church has definitely been abandoned by impartial non-Catholic historians. What does make the Reformation understandable is the spirit of nationalism. Rulers had every selfish reason to favor a revolt against Rome. After establishing national churches they could hope to control their subjects' consciences through religious sanctions as they had previously controlled them physically through civil power. Papal pronouncements on matters of right and wrong could no longer curb an ambitious and evil king. Then too, after revolting against Rome, a greedy ruler could enrich himself by seizing Church property. In the case of Henry VIII the Church's strict marriage code was another motive for revolt. The rulers, then, had plenty of selfish reasons to favor the Reformation; but how could the people be won over? Exaggerated nationalism gave an easy answer. People were told that they must choose between their nation and their Church. Because exaggerated nationalism was rife, large numbers chose the former. Their loyalty to the State was deeper than their loyalty to God. It was a clear case of, "My country right or wrong."

At the close of the eighteenth century the French Revolution brought to light certain strange, new aspects of the constantly developing nationalism. The Revolution was much more than the exchange of one political system for another. It was the introduction of a whole set of social ideals, thoroughly secular in character, which had gradually become popular during the materialistic eighteenth century.[13]

The entire force of French nationalism was capitalized to force these ideals on the people. It is not surprising to find secularism allied to exaggerated nationalism. Both were thoroughly opposed to the Church. They cooperated to produce a type of nationalistic, anticlerical liberalism which has been influential in Europe ever since, as for example in the Italy of Cavour. Hatred of the Church has gone hand in hand with exaggerated nationalism in many of the revolutionary movements of modern Europe.

Probably the Church has no more sinister enemy in the modern world than the spirit of exaggerated nationalism. Probably in no other way is the mystery of iniquity more visibly at work. This brand of nationalism sets up its own perverse system of ethics which is absolutely inconsistent, not only with Catholic teaching, but with all morality. Other errors depend on deception to lure men away from Christ; but exaggerated nationalism couples brute force to deceptiveness. All the enormous resources of the overpowerful modern State are capitalized for its purposes. The press, the cinema, the radio, spread propaganda. By a subtle understanding of human psychology all the human passions are appealed to and utilized: hatred, pride, anger, fear, lust. The hesitant are brought into line by threats; nor are these threats baseless, for the modern State does not scruple to use organized violence against the recalcitrant. Hitler's Germany has taught the same lesson in the twentieth century that Henry VIII's England taught in the sixteenth — the power of the nationalistic State to drive men from Christ by deception and brute force. The use of deception and brute force against Christ are the marks of the mystery of iniquity.

No wonder the temptation to conform to exaggerated nationalism can be overwhelmingly great. The tremendous power of the modern State is often marshaled against the Church. "The kings of the earth stood up, and the princes met together, against the Lord, and against his Christ."[14] To stand up against this operation of the mystery of

iniquity requires a vivid faith and great courage. Small wonder, then, if weak Catholics hesitate and then conform. This particular brand of conformism has various species. There are some cowards who frankly renounce their Catholicism in favor of an anticlerical nationalism. Others deceive themselves by rationalization and call their immoderate nationalism "patriotism," thus concealing a nasty vice under the name of a glorious virtue. Others attempt to curry favor with their enemies by maintaining a guilty silence on those Catholic doctrines which might be unacceptable to the extreme nationalist. Others, finally, simply refuse to face the issue. Cowards all! They are "ashamed of the gospel" in startling contrast to the great St. Paul.[15] These dastards, these cravens, these lily-livered poltroons are the allies, conscious or unconscious, of the mystery of iniquity.

The spirit of exaggerated nationalism (God be thanked!) has never progressed in the United States to a degree at all comparable with that found, for example, in Hitler's Germany. Yet even in this country the spirit has made considerable progress. In a recent study Conrad and Sanford presented 248 college students with the proposition, "The real American should be willing to fight for his country whether it is in the right or the wrong." More than half either approved this expression of exaggerated nationalism or were undecided.[16] What makes the finding more significant is the fact that the group studied proved to be, on the whole, decidedly skeptical and low in war morale. Presumably, more excitable groups may show a still more exaggerated nationalism. Since American nationalism has shown a tendency to become immoderate, at least in certain quarters, it behooves Catholics to examine their consciences to see whether they are properly equipped to resist a spirit which is so malign, so sinister, so opposed to the fundamental principles of the Christian religion.

This examination of conscience is very simple; for there is a crucial test which at once distinguishes the loyal,

patriotic Catholic from the exaggerated nationalist. To appreciate the significance of this test, recall once more that the very essence of exaggerated nationalism is that it puts "loyalty" to country above God's law. Remember also that the official and infallible interpreter of this law is the Catholic Church. In the light of these principles the test is easy to understand. Whenever nationalistic propaganda counsels a course of action which the Church, as the interpreter of the moral law, forbids, then the Catholic must make a definite choice. If he turns a deaf ear to the Church's teaching and follows nationalistic propaganda, he proves himself an immoderate nationalist. If he rejects the propaganda and follows Catholic teaching, he proves himself a loyal Catholic — and incidentally a real patriot, for exaggerated nationalism is the enemy of true patriotism. The test is simple, clear cut, and crucial.

Of course, in a well-ordered society this test situation ought never to arise. A Catholic should never be asked to choose between his nation and his God. As a matter of sober fact, however, it does arise all too frequently. It need not be the government which puts the Catholic to the test. Indeed in a country where decent government exists, exaggerated nationalism is not likely to be officially sanctioned. But even in such countries there are always to be found certain unofficial groups of self-styled "patriots" who exaggerate nationalism beyond the bounds of reason and demand that Catholics follow their lead under penalty of being dubbed "unpatriotic." As a result there is, perhaps, hardly any country in the world where Catholics are not frequently forced to choose between God's law and the dictates of exaggerated nationalism.

It is worth while emphasizing once more that a Catholic has no possible grounds for hesitation, once he is put to the test. "We must obey God rather than men."[17] Pope Leo XIII was very explicit about this. "There are certainly occasions when the State is seen to demand one thing, and the Church

another. This happens because the rulers of the State despise the sacred power of the Church or would subject it to themselves. Hence arises a conflict and an opportunity for proving one's virtue. Two powers press on us and no one can obey both at the same time when they issue contradictory orders. 'No man can serve two masters.' So, if one is obeyed, the other must be disobeyed. No one can be in doubt as to which of the two is to be preferred. Obviously it is a crime to fail in obedience to God for the sake of pleasing men. It is wrong to break the law of Jesus Christ to obey the magistrate or under pretense of obeying the civil law to transgress the law of the Church."[18] If the occasion arises it is clear that we must be Catholics first and Americans afterwards — no matter how much the fact may scandalize the Catholic conformists.

The present chapter is being written during a great war. It is a particularly appropriate time to make the suggested examination of conscience; for in time of war, when passions are aroused, it is specially difficult to tread the thin line which separates a true and generous patriotism from an immoderate nationalism. Let us, then, keep the fundamental principle in view. Is there any tendency on the part of American Catholics to turn a deaf ear to the pronouncements of the Holy Father and the accepted doctrine of the Church on moral issues and to listen instead to the mouthings of the extreme nationalists?

One point of Catholic teaching which is of supreme and decisive importance is the doctrine that the nation as well as the individual is subject to the laws of morality. Under stress of war this essential point is sometimes forgotten. In its crudest form the contrary error is expressed in the maxim, "My country right or wrong." During the present war I have actually seen this quoted by a Catholic college paper with apparent approval. Such a callow and obvious error is fortunately rare; yet in more subtle forms the same false principle frequently makes its appearance. Among

Catholics one rather often runs across the more or less tacit assumption that the sole duty of the citizen is to follow his national leaders in time of war. This is not true without qualification. The morality of a particular war is always subject to review by the individual conscience. It is indeed true that soldiers under the colors at the outbreak of war as well as conscripts who are later called up are bound to presume that the war is just unless they have a strong suspicion (*vehemens suspicio*) to the contrary, in which case they must examine the matter and follow their conscience. But others, such as volunteers, foreigners, and (according to Vermeersch) the learned and theologians also are bound to examine the morality of the war before they take an active part in it.[19]

It is certain beyond any doubt that a Catholic cannot be a conscientious objector in the sense of the absolute pacifists. In other words no Catholic may assert *a priori* that all wars are wrong and announce his intention of abstaining from any war at all regardless of the issues involved. But on the other hand, in the event that a Catholic knows with full moral certainty that a given war is unjust, he is bound to refuse to fight. Under these circumstances one not only may, but must, be a conscientious objector. It is strange that most Catholics are so reluctant to preach this doctrine, particularly in time of war when it is particularly relevant. It is a bit ironical that many Catholics hesitate to discuss the right of the human conscience to review the morality of a war, while the United States government does recognize this right at least in some form by making provision for the exemption of conscientious objectors.[20]

It is a tragic fact that exaggerated nationalism often prevents Catholic writers from expounding the full Catholic doctrine on the morality of war and makes them especially reluctant to apply these principles to a particular international situation fairly and objectively. Speaking of the Church's doctrine on the morality of war, John Eppstein,

an English convert and a distinguished authority on international relations, makes a charge which is unfortunately only too true. "He indeed would be an uncandid historian of Catholic thought, who did not admit that the virus of nationalism has powerfully infected Catholic thinkers at least in Europe upon this particular question during the past two generations. . . . The national bias of many Catholic theologians and publicists both before, during, and after the Great War, in dealing with this problem (which most of all demands clear thought and the absence of special pleading) has been so transparent, their response to the pacific leadership of the Holy See so meager and indeed contemptible, that the student must now be on his guard against taking the words of any particular Catholic divine or author as representing the mind of the Church as a whole."[21]

Eppstein charges that nationalistic bias warps the views of Catholic leaders in time of war. In this connection it is interesting to read the following statement of the German bishops: "The war is demanding of all of you great efforts and great sacrifices. In the accomplishment of the heavy duties of the times, in the hard visitations which the war will bring you, you may be strengthened by the consoling certainty that you are not only serving your country but also fulfilling the Holy Will of God."[22] To say the least it is a bit surprising to learn that the Catholic fighting Hitler's war is doing God's Holy Will. How hard it is to reconcile this with the statement of the American bishops: "At times it is the positive duty of a nation to wage war in the defense of life and right. Our country now finds itself in such circumstances."[23] The ordinary simple Catholic is apt to be a bit bewildered at these apparently contradictory statements. Can it be that in time of war the official declaration of a national hierarchy can reflect a nationalistic attitude rather than the attitude of the Church?

Eppstein charges that Catholics follow the pacific leadership of the Holy See to only a meager and contemptible

degree. This is an extremely serious indictment. Does it apply to Catholics in World War II? Unfortunately there is some evidence to show that it may. Take, for example, the question of a negotiated peace. The Holy Father has at various times appealed for a peace of this character. At least that would seem to be the import of such statements as the following from his Silver Jubilee address: "We make a warm, fatherly appeal to statesmen that they may not let any occasion pass that may open up to the nations, the road to an honest peace of justice and moderation, to a peace arising from a free and fruitful agreement, even if it should not correspond in all points to their aspirations."[24] There is certainly nothing in this appeal of the Pope's which could legitimately offend the just patriotism of the men of any nation. He does not demand peace at any price. He does not call for a peace without honor and justice. He merely asks that statesmen should not rule out *a priori* the possibility of a decent negotiated peace and he is realistic enough to see that to arrive at such a peace nations must be prepared to make some sacrifices. What reasonable man could quarrel with his stand?

On the other hand, the policy of the United Nations has been, up to the present, to exclude the possibility of a negotiated peace. That was the import of the Roosevelt-Churchill agreement at the Casablanca Conference. It was reaffirmed at Moscow when Britain, Russia, China, and the United States declared that they would "continue hostilities against those Axis powers with which they respectively are at war until such powers have laid down their arms on the basis of unconditional surrender."[25] Up to the time of the present writing this stand has never been retracted. It would seem that the United Nations have committed themselves to a stand which cannot be reconciled with the policy of the Holy Father. It is interesting to examine the attitude of American Catholics under the present set of circumstances in the light of Eppstein's indictment.

Ordinarily, Catholic public opinion in this country seems to be formed — or at least crystallized — principally by the Catholic press and by those of our organizations which interest themselves particularly in public issues. Where differences of opinion exist, the issue is argued pro and con until either a fair unanimity appears or else until the different viewpoints have taken clear and definite shape. This represents a first stage. A second stage sometimes follows when the bishops in a joint statement, or a great many of them in individual statements, pronounce on the merits of the controversy, praising what seems to be in accordance with the mind of the Church and censuring what does not. It is essentially a democratic process; for the roots of public opinion strike deeply into the masses of the people. Yet it is at the same time properly authoritarian since the vagaries of private judgment are curbed and sound opinions are approved by the teaching authority of the hierarchy.

In regard to the issue under discussion, the possibility of a negotiated peace, it seems fair to say that the ordinary media of Catholic public opinion, the press and organizations interested in such matters, have a disappointingly negative attitude. Not even the first of the two stages mentioned seems to have been reached. One might reasonably expect that our Catholic press would resound with the demand that, in accordance with the Holy Father's expressed wish, the possibility of a negotiated peace should at least be seriously considered by the administration. One might expect that resolutions would be passed by our organizations echoing the same demand. Surely there would be nothing unpatriotic about such a course of action. As citizens of a democracy, we Catholics, like all other citizens, have a perfect right to express our view publicly on matters of national policy. Yet American Catholics, as a body, have been noticeably silent on this point. In the words of Eppstein, their support of the pacific leadership of the Holy See

seems to have been "meager and indeed contemptible."

On September 1, 1943, Pope Pius spoke out clearly yet once more for peace. Immediately Frederick J. Libby, executive secretary for the National Council for Prevention of War, commended the Pope on the basis that he was apparently "condemning the Axis tyranny on the one hand and the Roosevelt-Churchill demand for unconditional surrender on the other."[26] On the same day that the Pope's statement appeared in the daily press I received an appeal from an organization called "The Peace Now Movement" condemning the policy of unconditional surrender and demanding that the possibilities of immediate peace be explored. In the meantime Catholic organizations had little to say. Is there not something ironical in the fact that the most vocal supporters of the papal peace policy in the United States should be non-Catholic organizations? Yes, one fears that Eppstein was right.

Another revealing point is the attitude of Catholics toward the bombing of noncombatants. Pope Pius XII has had more than a little to say on this point. To cite only one pronouncement, he has spoken with commiseration of the "many thousands of non-combatants, women, children, sick and aged, from whom aerial warfare — whose horrors We have from the beginning frequently denounced — has, without discrimination or through inadequate precautions, taken life, goods, health, home, charitable refuge, or house of prayer."[27]

This is obviously an important statement and it contains a number of valuable points which should serve for our guidance. Earlier in the war some Catholics had argued that in modern total warfare there are no noncombatants and that therefore the general bombing of civilians could be justified. This view seems hard to reconcile with the Holy Father's explicit mention of noncombatants. On the other hand it is important to note that the statement contains no condemnation of the bombing of military objectives even

though such bombing may incidentally involve the loss of some noncombatant life. What the Pope actually does is to "denounce" the "horrors" of aerial warfare, and these "horrors" seem to include casualties among noncombatants and the destruction of nonmilitary objectives such as private homes, charitable institutions, and churches. Furthermore, these unjustifiable evils may be brought about in two ways, either through bombing "without discrimination" or through bombing with "inadequate precautions." As examples of the former one may perhaps think of the German destruction of Coventry or later destruction of German cities by the United Nations.

Here is a rather explicit and evidently a very carefully worded declaration by the Holy See on a practical matter of the highest importance. No matter how one looks at it, it does not seem possible to explain it away. It does not seem possible to deny that in these words the Pope has denounced certain features of aerial warfare as practiced both by the Axis powers and the United Nations. Therefore one might reasonably expect that American Catholics would use their rights as citizens of a democracy and demand that aerial attacks be confined to the bombing of military objectives. If Catholics are to accept their principles on moral issues from the Holy See, and not from nationalistic propaganda, no other attitude would seem possible. Yet, as a matter of actual fact, our attitude has been far different. Except possibly on the occasion of the bombing of Rome, Catholics seem to have been just about as passive on the question of bombing noncombatants as their non-Catholic fellow citizens. Rome has spoken; but do we give heed?

Catholics sometimes betray a nationalistic bias in yet another way, namely, by their attitude toward communism and Nazism respectively. The proper, and indeed the *necessary,* Catholic attitude can be summed up in four propositions: (1) We must hate the communism of the Russian government. (2) We must love the Russian people.

(3) We must hate the Nazism of the German government. (4) We must love the German people. These propositions are true beyond the slightest shadow of a doubt and they remain true no matter who the allies or the enemies of the United States happen to be. They are true in time of peace and they are equally true in time of war. A good test of clearheaded Catholicity is to interview a man on these four propositions to see whether he is willing to assent to all of them with equal positiveness. There are some Catholics who betray their disloyalty to the Church by taking a biased view. They emphasize in the strongest language our obligation to hate Nazism and to love the Russian people — and thus far they are obviously right. But they betray their treacherous conformism, their cowardly and immoderate nationalism, by trying to explain away the horrors of communism or at least by maintaining a guilty silence on the matter, while they have never a word to say about the obligation of loving the German people. This type of conformism may lead to a temporary popularity in certain quarters, but it is nevertheless thoroughly despicable.

Unfortunately it would be only too easy to give other examples of the frequent temptations to exaggerated nationalism to which we are subject. However, it is not a pleasant subject to pursue and enough has been said to show how easy it is to form one's attitudes on moral issues on the basis of current propaganda rather than on the basis of the papal teaching. This tendency to look to the State rather than to the Church for judgments on right and wrong is — it is well to recall — precisely the essence of exaggerated nationalism. It seems safe to say that this evil, which has been denounced in such strong terms by Rome, is a very real danger in America today. To the weak-kneed conformist it is a very serious temptation; but the loyal Catholic who is strong in his faith will avoid it as he would avoid the plague.

Chapter 12

"COME OUT FROM AMONG THEM, BE SEPARATED"

WE CATHOLICS cannot hope to make any progress at all against the mystery of iniquity unless we pin our hope to the supernatural. If our wrestling were against flesh and blood, then the case would be different. We might expect to circumvent human malice by human means. But, as a matter of sober fact, our wrestling is not against flesh and blood. It is against the Principalities and the Powers; for, as Catholics, we must recognize a diabolical element in the problems which plague society. Against the keen, superhuman intelligences of fallen angels there is no recourse but the use of supernatural means. To forget this fact is to court disaster.

Of course, this does not mean that the natural has no importance; it means merely that the natural should be dominated by the supernatural. This principle applies to individuals and because it applies to them it applies also to society. The individual is perfectly justified in taking advantage of such natural goods as health, honor, wealth, or power; but he must not make these things ends in themselves; he must use them in ways which aid, and do not hinder, the attainment of his supernatural end which is heaven. The same is true of society. When men unite into a society, they do so for the attainment of some common purpose. This group purpose, like the purpose of each individual's private actions, must be something consistent with the acquisition of the beatific vision. The immediate

goal of the group may be something in the natural order. Thus an athletic club seeks health and recreation for its members. A business firm aims at profits. The State, the most inclusive of all natural societies, seeks the plenitude of temporal well-being for all its citizens. These are natural objectives, but they are praiseworthy only to the extent that in some way they facilitate the attainment of heaven. In the ultimate analysis, the end of all individual effort, the goal of all common striving, must be the beatific vision.

Since the beatific vision is absolutely supernatural, it cannot be attained by natural means. Here is where grace plays its part. By sanctifying grace man is able to merit heaven and added actual graces make possible or facilitate action on a supernatural plane. Thus all man's human acts, no matter how mundane they may appear on superficial view, can be made to serve his supernatural end. In the mysterious order of grace all voluntary actions, whether they be purely individual or social in character, may be supernaturalized. Among all the worthy social activities of man there is none either so earthly or so trivial that it may not lead to the beatific vision. A congressman makes a speech on the floor of the House; it ought to be a step toward heaven. A boy wins a baseball game for his team by hitting a home run in the ninth inning; it should be a supernatural act. A businessman signs his weekly pay-roll checks; he should advance nearer to heaven by doing so. It is the Catholic ideal that whether we eat or drink or whatsoever else we do, we should do it all to the glory of God and thus that all our activities should tend toward the beatific vision. This is an ideal of unspeakable beauty. If it were realized in practice, human society in this present world would take on a heavenly character. It would be a foretaste of the perfect social life of the blessed.

There is, of course, some slight danger that this ideal may be exaggerated. Now and then — though rarely — Catholic thinkers stress the supernatural to the point of

forgetting the natural. Such men are like the Thessalonian converts who were so concerned with the supposedly immediate second coming of Christ that they neglected the common-sense concerns of daily life. For such persons St. Paul had eminently sound advice. "If any man will not work, neither let him eat."[1] The danger of exaggerated supernaturalism is, however, enormously less threatening than the danger of exaggerated naturalism. For we live in a materialistic century and numberless temptations tend to lure us from the supernatural.

The Catholic social ideal, so gloriously supernatural in character, is opposed by the whole ethos of the modern world; for a basic dogma of contemporary civilization is the complete denial of the supernatural. Having rejected the grace of God, men tend toward a state of mental confusion in which even the principles of natural morality are obscured. Wrong is mistaken for right; and right for wrong. The greedy industrialist who has grown rich by crushing the poor is hailed as a hero. Unrestrained lust has become fashionable and smart. The indiscriminate slaughter of thousands of innocent noncombatants is praised as a worthy act. On the other hand, the poor, the humble, and the pious are derided. St. Paul's terrifying description of the pagans of his day applies only too aptly to the modern world. "As they have resolved against possessing the knowledge of God, God has given them up to a reprobate sense, so that they do what is not fitting; being filled with all iniquity, malice, immorality, avarice, wickedness; being full of envy, murder, contention, deceit, malignity; being whisperers, detractors, hateful to God, irreverent, proud, haughty, plotters of evil; disobedient to parents, foolish, dissolute, without affection, without fidelity, without mercy."[2]

It is easy to see the activity of the mystery of iniquity in this current revolt against the moral law. The mystery of iniquity is essentially an antisupernatural force, a force directed against the saving work of Jesus Christ. It under-

mines faith, and when faith is gone it is easy for men to forget about God entirely. Thus men gradually are led to the point where they harden their hearts against the truth. "They have resolved against possessing the knowledge of God." When God is forgotten human life becomes meaningless. There is nothing left but to seek a temporary satisfaction by giving free rein to the passions of cruelty and lust.

Of course, all this is completely and absolutely and unmistakably opposed to the essential elements of Catholic social doctrine. To attempt in any way to conciliate the two systems of thought — as the conformists do — is the sheerest folly. Whenever men of good will are found among the worldlings, we Catholics should naturally welcome their cooperation — but only on our own terms. To try to conciliate the world by disingenuously modifying the purity of our doctrine is a most tragic error. The social teaching of the Church and the thought of worldly sociologists and publicists are separated by an impassable abyss. It is an utter waste of time to try to find a common ground on which the two contradictory systems can meet. Catholics must accept the fact that their social thought is unique and stands apart from the thinking of the modern world. "For what has justice in common with iniquity? Or what fellowship has light with darkness? What harmony is there between Christ and Belial? Or what part has the believer with the unbeliever?"[3]

The corollary is clear. Catholics must recognize that their social doctrine is completely distinctive and completely irreconcilable with the perverse contemporary spirit. We must stand by ourselves in honorable isolation. We must break sharply and clearly with the modern world. "Come out from among them, be separated."[4] We must be faithful to our own system of social thought which is altogether unique and distinctive. "Be not conformed to this world, but be transformed in the newness of your mind."[5]

In the quotation just given, St. Paul speaks of a transformation, a metamorphosis. Baptism does not work a small change in the Catholic. It changes him in a very fundamental sense. The Christian in the state of grace is no longer a mere natural man. He is divinized. He is something unique, something unprecedented in human history, a novel and strange phenomenon, "a new creation."[6] Christians are "partakers of the divine nature."[7] Grace introduces a completely new element into human history; naturalistic thought is wholly and entirely and completely and absolutely incompetent to comprehend this startling novelty.

"Put on the Lord Jesus Christ," says St. Paul.[8] Thus he commands Christians to begin a new, strange, and unprecedented form of life. What does this imply? It implies, first of all, a new way of thinking. The worldly man gains his knowledge solely by the use of natural reason. Of course, this process is entirely valid as far as it goes, but faith gives the Christian an infinitely deeper approach to reality. It gives him a divine knowledge which the purest human genius is utterly inadequate to attain. "The sensual man" — better, perhaps, the *natural* man, ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος, that is, the man who depends on human intelligence and nothing else — "does not perceive the things that are of the Spirit of God, for it is foolishness to him and he cannot understand."[9] Of course, the content of revelation is not, objectively speaking, foolish. It does not contradict, yet it does transcend human reason. Because it transcends reason, because it belongs in a region where the unaided human spirit cannot penetrate, it can appear "foolishness" to the man who rejects supernatural faith and depends entirely on mere human intelligence to lead him to the truth.

The Catholic who wishes to "put on the Lord Jesus Christ" must frankly reject the naturalistic viewpoint of the worldly thinker. He must submit his intelligence to God and humbly accept the truths of revelation even when he cannot understand them. He must be prepared to receive

truths which appear mere "foolishness" from the standpoint of worldly wisdom. By submitting his intelligence to this divine "foolishness," he does not, of course, stultify himself; on the contrary he gains infinitely in intellectual stature. "For the foolishness of God is wiser than men."[10]

In the field of social thought there are plenty of opportunities to choose between the divine truth revealed by God and the weak wisdom of the natural man. The genuine Catholic who wishes to "put on the Lord Jesus Christ" will unhesitatingly choose the former. The weak and faltering conformist often chooses the latter. Here, then, is a practical test by which a man may prove the quality of his Catholicity. Revealed social truth is known from the Holy Scriptures and from the whole Catholic tradition. It is interpreted and applied to current issues by the official pronouncements of the Holy See. Often this divine truth appears to contradict worldly wisdom. It appears "foolishness" to the natural man. Let a man, therefore, ask himself where he stands when worldly social thought conflicts with Catholic doctrine. The world exalts wealth; Christ preached poverty. How does he feel on that issue? Nationalism praises the bombing of noncombatants; the Holy See condemns it. Does he dare to agree openly with the papal position? Prejudice generates hatred of the Negro; Catholic social thought demands universal charity. Will he love the Negro as a brother? The spirit of the times praises sensuality; the Church condemns lust and preaches corporal penance. Will he mortify his flesh? The test is exact and specific and (alas!) exceedingly revealing.

Many Catholics have blind spots in their social thinking. One man, perhaps, accepts wholeheartedly the doctrine of interracial love; but he considers it "inopportune" or "imprudent" or "out of place" to preach against exaggerated nationalism in time of war. Another bravely fights for social justice for the workingman, but he fights on a basis of purely natural ethics; in his view it is "inexpedient" to

emphasize the supernatural thought of the social encyclicals. Against this attitude of limited loyalty it is supremely important to grasp one telling truth: The man who accepts the social doctrine of the Church only partially does not really accept it at all. For by claiming the right to pick and choose, he sets up his own reason as a sort of supreme court with the right to review the Church's social teaching, accepting one element and passing over another as he sees fit. Thus he makes his own human intelligence the final arbiter of truth. He preaches one Catholic social doctrine for the precise reason that it happens to appeal to him. He explains away another doctrine, or passes over it in disingenuous silence, because, forsooth, it displeases him. Thus in practice his ultimate criterion of truth is his own reason and not divine revelation.

The social thinker who wishes to "put on the Lord Jesus Christ" must accept the whole doctrine of the Church without claiming the privilege of reviewing it. Does the Holy See enunciate a proposition which happens to accord with his own thinking? Very well, he preaches it. Does the Holy See some other time make a statement which is unacceptable to all his previous notions and which irritates all his prejudices? It makes no difference; he makes this unpalatable doctrine his own and preaches it with just as much loyalty, just as much emphasis, just as much sincerity, as the one he found so acceptable. This is the only possible attitude for the genuine Catholic. It is the only possible attitude for the man of faith. Just to the extent that a man departs from this attitude, he ceases to think with the Church.

Just as the real Catholic accepts the whole social doctrine of the Church without revision, so also he unhesitatingly follows the lead of the Church in his practical social action. The crucial point here is his willingness to trust the effectiveness of supernatural means. Of course, this does not imply that natural means must be discarded; Catholic tradition has never demanded that. But it does mean that we must

follow the example of the saints by showing a strong faith in the means of grace as instruments of social reform. All Catholics can easily agree on the legitimacy of such natural means as the press, the radio, and all other channels of publicity, the value of organizations, conventions, committees, the worth of social legislation, social work, and collective bargaining. There is no dispute about such measures. But does a man stop at these things? Is he silent about the Mass, prayer, and the sacraments as measures of social betterment? Does he pass over in silence the efficacy of these supernatural means or pay them only a halfhearted lip service? If so, he is not fully Catholic in his social outlook.

A crucial point in this connection is our attitude toward the use of prayer and penance. Again and again the Popes, in discussing social problems, have urged us to have recourse to these efficacious remedies. "The evil which today torments humanity," said Pope Pius XI, "can be conquered only by a world-wide crusade of prayer and penance."[11] Here is a solemn pronouncement of the Holy See; yet how often Catholics meet to discuss all sorts of natural remedies for social evils and seemingly forget that "only" by penance and prayer can such ills be vanquished.

Among all forms of prayer the Mass is incomparably the greatest. The Mass is a prayer and more than a prayer. It is a sacrifice identical in nature with the sacrifice of Calvary. On Calvary all grace is won for man. Our supernatural form of social life, which can transform our social living into a thing of incomparable beauty, was made possible by Christ's death on the cross. If we wish to transform the world and restore all things in Christ, we must press close to the Mass, the great source of charity and supernatural life. "In the final analysis every true and lasting reform has proceeded from the sanctuary."[12] The conformist may forget this most important fact; it is the mark of the genuine Catholic that he constantly bears it in mind.

Because genuinely Catholic ideals and techniques of social reform are so diametrically opposed to the spirit of the modern world, the man who follows them faithfully must expect persecution. Christ first exemplified these ideals and as a direct result He earned the implacable hatred of the privileged classes. "He is stirring up the people,"[13] they said; and they put Him to death like a criminal. Can we, who seek to follow His example, expect to come off unscathed? "No disciple is above his teacher, nor is the servant above his master."[14] Indeed the hatred of the world is the very mark of our success. "Blessed shall you be when men hate you. . . . Woe to you when all men speak well of you!"[15] If we are to follow Christ loyally, there is not the slightest possibility of escaping disgrace and suffering. Only at the price of sweat and tears and blood can society be regenerated.

No wonder that cowards quail at the prospect. No wonder that some seek to soften the impact of the world's hatred by modifying the character of Catholic social teaching and social action a bit here and there. It is all too easy to fall into this temptation. The Catholic sociologist proclaims that his subject is a "purely empirical, nonethical science"; he promises to remain silent about the supernatural, thus hoping to avoid the ridicule of his non-Catholic colleagues. The publicist talks about the race question in generalities; he seeks to avoid the opprobrium which would fall upon him if he denounced specific abuses and himself set an example by treating Negroes as equals. The editor softens the brave and caustic statements which the Holy Father has made about the war, lest fools brand him "unpatriotic." Economists are meek and conciliatory in discussing the sins of wealth, whereas our Lord joined the working class and whipped the businessmen out of the temple. Our social workers rejoice in their professional living standard and treat the poor with professional detachment, while the saints shared personally the wretchedness of the needy and show-

ered on them a warm, personal love. Thus while they deny no Catholic doctrine, our conformists make a thousand tiny compromises to avoid the hatred and ridicule of the world.

Not by such hesitant individuals will the face of the earth be renewed. There is an instructive story in the Book of Judges which shows the power of an elite of tried and true men who put their faith in the Lord. When Gedeon marshaled his forces against the Madianites he was appalled to find that he could count only thirty-two thousand men against one hundred and thirty-five thousand of the enemy. The odds seemed hopeless, yet the Lord's comment was, "The people that are with thee are many"; and at the divine command he proclaimed, "Whosoever is fearful and timorous, let him return," and twenty-two thousand of the faint-hearted slunk away. To human estimation it must have seemed that Israel had thrown away all hope of victory by this daring purge, yet still the Lord was not satisfied. "The people are still too many," He proclaimed and bade Gedeon submit his men to a new and different test which only three hundred passed successfully. Yet these three hundred tested and picked men with the aid of God's mighty power overthrew the vast hosts of the Madianites.[16]

The power of the Church seems weak and small to human eyes compared to the overwhelming forces of the Kingdom of Satan. The temptation is to compromise lest we be crushed by the redoubtable power of the enemy. Yet the problem is not our lack of numbers; God does not need numbers to accomplish His marvelous work. The problem is rather that there are too many of the "fearful and timorous" in our ranks. A handful of men are enough to regenerate the world, but they must be tried men and true, humble and willing instruments in the hands of God. Christ chose twelve Apostles to preach the Gospel to the whole world, but they were men of faith and unafraid of martyrdom. What the Church needs now is not a vast army of the "fearful and timorous," but an elite of brave souls, saints and near saints,

or at least those who are willing humbly to strive toward sanctity. They must be men who spurn compromise. They must be men who accept the teaching of the Church with simple faith without trying to revise it in the light of human reason. They must be men who do not know how to fear the world's threats because they are avid of martyrdom.

There is an incident in the life of Christ which can serve as a sort of parable to illustrate the nature of Catholic social action. One day Peter and his companions had been fishing unsuccessfully on Lake Genesareth. They had given up in discouragement and now they were washing their nets on the shore. Then Christ came along and told Peter, "Put out into the deep, and lower your nets for a catch." It must have seemed like a foolish command. Peter was a professional fisherman. He must have known every depth and shoal of the lake, every trick of the wind and the weather, every habit of the fish he sought. He must have known that from the standpoint of human probability Christ's suggestion bore no hope of success. Yet Peter was also a man of ready faith, so he said, "Master the whole night through we have toiled and have taken nothing; but at thy word I will lower the net." And what was the result? Why, the result was that which always follows a literal and uncritical acceptance of the Lord's word. "They enclosed a great number of fishes, but their net was breaking. And they beckoned to their comrades in the other boat to come and help them. And they came and filled both the boats, so that they began to sink."[17]

As Peter was a professional fisherman, so some of us are professional students of society. We have studied the standard authors, we have had experience in practical work, we have perhaps carried out projects of original research. Thus we have gained a certain expert knowledge of society and on the basis of this human wisdom — which we share with our non-Catholic colleagues — we have framed certain

projects for social betterment. Then Christ appears and through the infallible voice of His Church He commands some course of action which seems to set at naught all our hard-won experience, something that would excite the ridicule of all our non-Catholic friends. Here is the test. If, like the conformists, we reject the divine suggestion in its unmodified purity, then we shall be left to the unfruitfulness of our human devices. But if like Peter we set aside our professional prejudices and follow the Lord's command with strong faith, then like Peter we shall obtain results which wholly surpass all human expectation, miraculous results which outdistance our fondest hopes.

"Put out into the deep." It is Christ's command. We must launch our projects on a sea of uncertainty with only His word to give us hope. Only His word — but it is enough. Guided by His wisdom, protected by His strong arm, we shall have no fear. The tempests of hell may rage, but they are powerless to injure us if Christ is in our midst. From Him we draw the supernatural strength to overcome the mystery of iniquity.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 1

[1] Edward B. Reuter, *Handbook of Sociology* (New York: Dryden Press, 1941), p. 12. For a general discussion of the philosophic background of American sociology, see, William T. O'Connor, *Naturalism and the Pioneers of American Sociology* (Washington: Catholic University Press, 1942) and, Sister Roberta Snell, *The Nature of Man in St. Thomas Aquinas Compared With the Nature of Man in American Sociology* (Washington: Catholic University Press, 1942).

[2] Harold A. Phelps, *Contemporary Social Problems* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1939), p. 3.

[3] J. H. S. Bossard, *Social Change and Social Problems* (New York: Harper, 1938), p. 3.

[4] John L. Gillin, *Social Pathology* (New York: Century, 1933), p. 530.

[5] George B. Mangold, *Social Pathology* (New York: Macmillan, 1932), p. viii.

[6] J. L. Gillin, C. G. Dittmer, and R. J. Colbert, *Social Problems* (New York: Century, 1932), p. 44.

[7] Mabel A. Elliott and Francis E. Merrill, *Social Disorganization* (New York: Harper, 1934).

[8] Stuart A. Queen and Jennette R. Gruener, *Social Pathology; Obstacles to Social Participation* (New York: Crowell, 1940).

[9] Rom. 1:20–22. Here and throughout, unless otherwise specified, New Testament quotations follow the Confraternity Version (Paterson: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1941).

[10] Rom. 1:23.

[11] See the canons of the Council of Carthage, approved by Pope Zosimus, and also the words of Pope Celestine I in, Henricus Denziger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum* (Fribourg: Herder, 1932), §§ 103, 105, 132.

[12] Phil. 3:20. The old Challoner-Rheims Version (the so-called Douay Version) translated, "Our conversation is in heaven." This was a passable translation of the Greek πολίτευμα at the time the version was published; for *conversation* formerly meant "the action of consorting with others; living together; commerce, society, intimacy" (*The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, sub hoc verbo*). This meaning became obsolete after 1770 (*ibid.*); yet how many sermons have been preached on the text on the mistaken assumption that *conversation* meant *talk* or *discourse!*

[13] 2 Thess. 2:7.

[14] For a discussion of the various senses of μυστήριον (mystery) see, Ferdinand Prat, *La théologie de saint Paul* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1909–1912), 2:393–396.

[15] *"Peccatum contra Deum commissum quamdam infinitatem habet ex infinitate divinae majestatis."* St. Thomas, *Sum. Th.*, III, q. 1, a. 2, ad 2.

[16] 2 Thess. 2:3. St. Paul does not

mention Antichrist by name. The term is due to St. John (1 John 2:18, 22; 4:3; 2 John 7). But commentators generally identify St. Paul's "man of sin" with Antichrist. All that is known concerning this mysterious figure is well summarized in, V. Ermoni, "Antéchrist," in Vacant-Mangenot, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,* 1:1361–1365. The view that Antichrist is not an individual but a collectivity is well presented by D. Buzy, "Antéchrist," in Pirot, *Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplément,* 1:297–305. For the contrary view see, A. Plummer, The *Epistles of St. John* (Cambridge: University Press, 1886), pp. 156–160.

[17] 2 Thess. 2:7. The nature of the "obstacle" has puzzled commentators. It is spoken of both as a person (masculine) and as a thing (neuter). One plausible explanation is that the obstacle is St. Michael (masculine) and the heavenly host (neuter). See, Prat, *Théologie de saint Paul,* 1:115–117.

[18] 2 Thess. 2:1–12. For a fuller explanation see standard commentaries, especially, Joseph Knabenbauer, *Commentarium in Epistolas ad Thessalonicenses* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1913), J. E. Frame, *Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians* (New York: Scribner, 1912), and Prat, *Théologie de saint Paul,* 1:113–120. For those who wish a more popular explanation, the simple but highly accurate comments of Charles J. Costello in, The Catholic Biblical Association, *A Commentary on the New Testament* (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1942) are to be recommended.

[19] 2 Thess. 2:9–10.

[20] Apoc. 13:7.

[21] Apoc. 13:14. The interpretation of these symbols is obscure in detail. See, E. B. Allo, *Saint Jean: l'Apocalypse* (Paris: Gabalda, 1935). It is helpful to remember that St. John was writing on Patmos with the sea to the west and the land to the east. The seat of the Roman Empire, an evil civil government which was persecuting the Christians, was to the west. From the east came oriental cults and superstitions which tended to corrupt the faith of the weak. Hence, the symbolism of the Beast of the Sea and the Beast of the Earth.

[22] The other senses are (1) the universe, (2) the earth, (3) the inhabitants of the earth. The word *world* translates two different Greek words in the original text, but the distinction is not important. For a discussion see, Paul H. Furfey, "Social Action in the Early Church, 30–180 A.D. I. The Church and the World," *Theol. Studies,* 2:171–197, May, 1942.

[23] "The kingdom of this world." Apoc. 11:15. "The prince of the world." John 12:31; 14:30. "The prince of this world." John 16:11.

[24] *"Certe iniquorum omnium caput diabolus est, et hujus capitis membra sunt omnes iniqui."* St. Gregory the Great, *Homilia 16 in Evangelia,* PL, 76:1135. See also 1 John 5:19 and the discussion of it in, Paul H. Furfey, *Fire on the Earth* (New York: Macmillan, 1936), p. 63. Also, St. Thomas, *Sum. Th.,* III, q. 8, a. 7.

[25] Rom. 16:25–26, 1 Tim. 3:16.

[26] Encyclical, *Divini Redemptoris,* March 19, 1937.

[27] *Ibid.*

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] *Ibid.*

[30] Encyclical, *Mit brennender Sorge,* March 14, 1937.

[31] Letter of Cardinal Gasparri, Papal Secretary of State, to Archbishop Chesnelong of Sens, October 7, 1917.

[32] Encyclical, *Quadragesimo anno,* May 15, 1931.

[33] Encyclical, *Mirae caritatis,* May 28, 1902.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 2

[1] Luke 6:22–23.

[2] Luke 6:26.

[3] Eph. 6:12.

[4] His encyclical, *Pascendi dominici gregis,* Sept. 8, 1907, contains a very clear exposition of Modernist doctrines as well as a condemnation of them.

[5] Encyclical, *Ubi arcano Dei consilio,* Dec. 23, 1922.

[6] On social Modernism see, Narciso Noguer, "La primera encíclica de Pío XI y el modernismo social," *Razón y Fe,* 65:290–306, March, 1923. Noguer mentions particularly some exaggerated doctrines on wages and on the position of women, together with a noticeable neglect of supernatural charity.

[7] Encyclical, *Graves de communi re,* Jan. 18, 1901.

[8] Letter to Bishop Bougoüin, July 29, 1912.

[9] Letter, *Notre Charge,* Aug. 25, 1910. Some Catholics have argued forcefully, but, I think, quite unconvincingly, in favor of interconfessional associations for social ends on the basis of the encyclical of Pope Pius X, *Singulari quadam,* Sept. 24, 1912. The question at issue had to do with the interconfessional Christian Trade Unions of Germany. The papal decision was *tolerari posse et permitti.* It would be rash to generalize from this toleration and permission, however, for the Pope made it clear that it was granted only "in view of the peculiar situation of the Church in Germany." Moreover, he clearly declared that he realized the arrangement involved dangers and he ordered that special precautions be taken to avoid these. He explicitly stated his preference for exclusively Catholic unions. See, Wilfrid Parsons, "Intercredal Cooperation in the Papal Documents," *Theol. Studies,* 4:159–182, June, 1943, and John Courtney Murray, "Intercredal Co-operation: Its Theory and Its Organization," *Theol. Studies,* 4:257–286, June, 1943. See also the present writer's criticism of these two articles in the form of a letter to the editor, *Theol. Studies,* 4:467–472, Sept., 1943.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 3

[1] Quoted from a mimeographed set of retreat notes which a friend kindly made available to the author. It seems to be the part of charity not to mention the name of the retreat master.

[2] See the condemnation of the errors of Baius, Molinos, Jansen, and

Quesnel, Denziger, *Enchiridion*, §§ 1036, 1037, 1038, 1224, 1297, 1394.

[3] Such at least is the doctrine of St. Thomas who teaches that all non-sinful acts of the Catholic in a state of grace are meritorious and therefore supernatural. *"Habentibus caritatem omnis actus est meritorius vel demeritorius." De malo*, q. 2, a. 5, ad. 7.

[4] *Sum. Th.*, II-II, q. 168, a. 2.

[5] Rom. 10:14.

[6] 2 Cor. 10:4–5.

[7] 1 Cor. 1:26.

[8] Acts 2:42.

[9] Acts 4:32.

[10] 1 John 5:4.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 4

[1] Matt. 11:29; 19:21; John 13:15.

[2] Luke 2:46–47.

[3] Among the abundant treatments of the Pharisees and Sadducees see especially, H. L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (Munich: Beck, 1922–1928), 4:334–352. There is less on the Herodians, but see the rather controversial article, B. W. Bacon, "Pharisees and Herodians in Mark," *Jour. Bib. Lit.*, 39:102–112, 1920.

[4] John 7:48.

[5] On the economic conditions of Palestine in our Lord's day see, F. M. Heichelheim, "Roman Syria," in Tenney Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1933–1940), 4:121–257; G. H. Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1928–1935); and S. Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie* (Leipzig: Fock, 1910–1912).

[6] John 7:49. It is interesting to compare with this a saying attributed to Hillel, a famous teacher of the time of Herod the Great. According to his opinion, a commoner (*'am ha-'areṣ*), that is, one who did not follow the Pharisaic tradition, could not attain holiness. *Aboth*, 2:6.

[7] Luke 7:22.

[8] Mark 6:3; Matt. 13:55. See also E. F. Sutcliffe, "The Divine Carpenter," *Irish Theol. Quart. Rev.*, 11:147–163, April, 1916.

[9] John 2:15. It seems certain that Christ drove the businessmen out of the temple on two occasions, though some commentators have argued in favor of one expulsion. The second occasion was near the end of Christ's life. See on this question, H. Lusseau and M. Collomb, *Les Évangiles* (Paris: Téqui, 1932), pp. 718–720.

[10] Matt. 19:24.

[11] It must be noted, however, that the word *rich* where it occurs in translations of the New Testament does not have quite its current meaning. See the discussion in, Paul H. Furfey, "Πλούσιος and Cognates in the New Testament," *Cath. Biblical. Quart.*, 5:243–263, June, 1943, where the following paraphrase is suggested for the verse about the needle's eye, "The typical member of the bourgeoisie, with his characteristic tendency to overvalue money, lacks the detachment necessary to enter the kingdom of heaven."

[12] Matt. 23:3.

[13] Mark 7:8.

[14] See the long denunciation which occupies the twenty-third chapter

of St. Matthew and from which these phrases are taken.

[15] "The Pharisees went out and immediately took counsel with the Herodians against him, how they might do away with him." Mark 3:6.

[16] Luke 13:32.

[17] See especially, Matt. 16:1–12.

[18] Luke 23:2, 5.

[19] Eric Gill, "St. Teresa of Lisieux," *Christ. Soc. Art Quart.*, 2(2):19–24, 33. Spring, 1939, p. 19.

[20] John 6:15.

[21] Luke 18:34.

[22] Matt. 10:24–25.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 5

[1] These theories were expounded by Comte in the opening chapter of his *Cours de philosophie positive* which was published in Paris, 1830–1842. The quotations in this paragraph were taken from Harriet Martineau's translation of this work, *The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte* (New York: William Gowans, 1868), p. 26.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 431.

[3] For a discussion of the philosophical implications of this sociological method see, Paul H. Furfey, *Three Theories of Society* (New York: Macmillan, 1937). Professor Sorokin of Harvard has been notable for his repeated protests against the abuse of the positivist method by sociologists. There are also interesting developments in Europe along nonpositivistic lines. Especially interesting is the school of thought called *die verstehende Soziologie,* associated particularly with the names of Weber and Sombart.

[4] George A. Lundberg, *Social Research* (New York: Longmans, 1929), p. 16. For the philosophical assumptions of current sociology see, O'Connor, *Naturalism and the Pioneers of American Sociology,* and Snell, *The Nature of Man in St. Thomas Compared with the Nature of Man in American Sociology,* already cited, and also, Theodore M. Hemelt, *Final Moral Values in Sociology* (Washington: Sulpician Seminary Press, 1929).

[5] Arthur L. Kimball and Peter I. Wold, *A College Text-book of Physics* (New York: Holt, 1937), p. 1.

[6] Luke 19:14.

[7] "Sociology is the social science *par excellence.*" Edwin R. A. Seligman, "What Are the Social Sciences," in *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences,* 1:3–7.

[8] *Civiltà Cattolica,* 2:390, May 30, 1931. Compare the German rendering as *Gesellschaftswissenschaft,* that is, *sociology* in, Gustav Gundlach, *Die sozialen Rundschreiben Leos XIII. und Pius' XI.* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1931), p. 75.

[9] Joseph Husslein, *Social Wellsprings. Volume II. Eighteen Encyclicals of Social Reconstruction by Pope Pius XI* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1942), pp. 183–184, *footnote.*

[10] Oswald von Nell-Breuning, *Reorganization of Social Economy.* Translated by Bernard W. Dempsey (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1936), p. 35.

[11] The book is one *"que á las esenciales condiciones de pureza de doctrina y de orientaciones, reuna la claridad y sencillez en el método." Acta Ap. Sedis,* 2:131. The letter is dated Jan. 25, 1910.

[12] *"Instruzione della Sacra Congregazione degli Affari Ecclesiastici Straordinari sull'Azione popolare cristiana o democratico-cristiana in Italia," Acta S. Sedis,* 34:401–413. The instruction is dated Jan. 27, 1902.

[13] *"Scientiae enim profanae, quas vocant, rei socialis atque oeconomicae doctrina, bonum sive singulorum sive societatis nequeunt subduci principiis philosophicis ac religiosis, quae attinent ad hominis originem, naturam et finem."* Pope Pius XI, Letter, *Sollemnia iubilaria,* Sept. 12, 1938.

[14] Pope Pius XI, Encyclical, *Quadragesimo anno,* May 15, 1931.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 6

[1] Matt. 6:24, Luke 16:13. *Mammon* is an Aramaic word signifying *wealth, possessions.*

[2] Luke 16:13.

[3] Matt. 13:22.

[4] Apoc. 18:17.

[5] Apoc. 18:19.

[6] Luke 18:23.

[7] 1 Tim. 6:10.

[8] 1 Tim. 6:17.

[9] James 1:10.

[10] James 2:1–7.

[11] Luke 16:19.

[12] Luke 12:19.

[13] Luke 6:24.

[14] Luke 12:19.

[15] James 4:13–14.

[16] See, for example, Aristotle, *Politica,* 1318 a. For a more complete discussion of the meaning of the word see, Paul H. Furfey, "Πλούσιος and Cognates in the New Testament," *Cath. Bib. Quart.,* 5:243–263, July, 1943, and the references there cited.

[17] The latest evidence is conveniently summarized in, Tenney Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1933–1940).

[18] St. Thomas, *De regimine principum,* 2:3.

[19] Amos 7:14. In the quotations from the Old Testament I have changed the readings of the Douay Version slightly whenever it seemed necessary to do so to bring them into better conformity with the Hebrew text.

[20] Amos 8:4–6.

[21] Amos 6:13.

[22] Amos 6:4–6.

[23] Amos 5:11.

[24] Amos 6:8–9.

[25] Amos 8:10. Those who wish to pursue further the study of Amos are referred to, A. van Hoonacker, *Les douze petits prophètes traduits et commentés* (Paris: Gabalda, 1908) — an excellent treatment.

[26] Isa. 1:21–23.

[27] Isa. 5:8.

[28] Isa. 3:14–15.

[29] Isa. 3:24. For an excellent commentary and translation of Isaias see, A. van Hoonacker, *Het Boek Isaias* (Brugge: Sinte Catharina Drukkerij, 1932).

[30] James 5:1–6.

[31] James 2:6–7.

[32] Encyclical, *Quadragesimo anno,* May 15, 1931.

[33] An outstanding Catholic treatment is, John F. Cronin, *Economics and Society* (New York: American Book Company, 1939).

[34] *Quadragesimo anno.*

[35] Maurice Leven and Others, *America's Capacity to Consume* (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1934), p. 56.

[36] National Resources Planning

Board, *Our National Resources* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1940), p. 4.
[37] Matt. 25:41–43.
[38] Luke 10:31.
[39] Acts 4:29.
[40] Matt. 3:4.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 7

[1] Matt. 25:40.
[2] The contrast between the methods of the saints and the methods of modern philanthropy is developed at some length in, Mary E. Walsh, *The Saints and Social Work* (Silver Spring, Md.: Preservation of the Faith, 1937).
[3] For a sane and moderate discussion of psychiatric results see, Thomas V. Moore, *Dynamic Psychology* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1926). A briefer and more elementary treatment is, Paul H. Furfey, *New Lights on Pastoral Problems* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1931).
[4] Mark 9:28.
[5] Lucian L. Lauerman, *Catholic Education for Social Work* (Washington: Catholic University, forthcoming).

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 8

[1] Joseph Cardijn, *La J. O. C. devant le Problème de la Jeunesse salariée* (Brussels: Éditions Jocistes, 1938), p. 37.
[2] M. Robberechts, *Charles Bouchard* (Brussels: Éditions Jocistes, 1935), Fernand Tonnet, *Un Jociste, Raymond Delplancq* (Brussels: Éditions Jocistes, 1938), Philippe Mosane, *Mieke, la fiancée du Coin du Diable* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, n.d.).
[3] From his letter to Cardinal Verdier on the occasion of the Paris congress of 1937. Various papal statements are collected conveniently in *Notes de Pastorale Jociste,* 8:69–76, April, 1939.
[4] Encyclical, *Graves de communi re,* Jan. 18, 1901.
[5] Encyclical, *Mirae caritatis,* May 28, 1902. For further quotations of similar import see, Paul H. Furfey, "Personalistic Social Action in the 'Rerum Novarum' and 'Quadragesimo Anno,'" *Am. Cath. Soc. Rev.,* 2:204–216, Dec., 1941.
[6] Encyclical, *Quadragesimo anno,* May 15, 1931.
[7] *Ibid.* See also, Pope Pius X, Encyclical, *Singulari quadam,* Sept. 24, 1912.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 9

[1] Lewis M. Terman, *Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938), pp. 13, 321.
[2] O. L. Harvey, "Some Statistics Derived from Recent Questionnaire Studies Relative to Human Sexual Behavior," *Jour. Soc. Psychol.,* 3:97–100, Feb., 1932.
[3] Robert S. Lynd and Helen M. Lynd, *Middletown in Transition* (New York: Harcourt, 1937), p. 169.
[4] Dorothy D. Bromley and Florence

H. Britten, *Youth and Sex* (New York: Harper, 1938), p. 4.

[5] Gilbert Van T. Hamilton, *A Research in Marriage* (New York: Boni, 1929), pp. 1, 346.

[6] Hornell Hart, "Changing Social Attitudes and Interests" in, President's Research Committee on Social Trends, *Recent Social Trends in the United States* (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1933), pp. 382–442. See especially pp. 416–421.

[7] Henry Neumann, *Modern Youth and Marriage* (New York: Appleton, 1928), pp. 42–43.

[8] Phyllis Blanchard and Carolyn Manasses, *New Girls for Old* (New York: Macaulay, 1930), p. 262.

[9] See, Edgar Schmiedeler, *25 Years of Uncontrol* (Huntington, Ind.: Sunday Visitor Press, 1943) for a brief but very competent criticism of the "birth control" movement.

[10] Katherine B. Davis, *Factors in the Sex Life of Twenty-two Hundred Women* (New York: Harper, 1929), p. 14.

[11] Frederick J. Taussig, *Abortion, Spontaneous and Induced* (St. Louis: Mosby, 1936), pp. 26, 366.

[12] R. R. Kuczynski, "Births," *Enc. Soc. Sci.,* 2:568–572.

[13] Birth rates for 1915 to 1940 from, *Statistical Abstract of the United States 1941* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1942), table 93. Rate for 1942 from personal communication from the United States Census Bureau. Note that the Birth Registration Area changed as new states were added after 1915.

[14] Rates for 1887 and 1911 from *Statistical Abstract,* table 105. Rate for 1940 from Census Bureau.

[15] Hart, *op. cit.,* p. 417.

[16] The exact percentage of women on the labor force was 14.7 in 1870, 23.4 in 1940, and 31.9 in July, 1943. See, Mary Robinson, "Woman Workers in Two Wars," *Monthly Labor Rev.,* 57:650–671, Oct., 1943.

[17] Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment Statistics Division, "Wartime Employment of Women in Manufacturing," *Monthly Labor Rev.,* 57:723–728, Oct., 1943.

[18] Pope Leo XIII, Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum,* May 15, 1891.

[19] Pope Pius XI, Encyclical, *Quadragesimo anno,* May 15, 1931.

[20] Pope Benedict XV, Letter, *Natalis trecentesimi,* Dec. 27, 1917.

[21] Pope Pius XI, Encyclical, *Rappresentanti in terra,* Dec. 31, 1929.

[22] Pope Pius XI, Encyclical, *Casti connubii,* Dec. 31, 1930.

[23] P. K. Whelpton and Clyde V. Kiser, "Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility. I. Differential Fertility among 41,498 Native-White Couples in Indianapolis," *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly,* 21:221–280, July, 1943.

[24] Bernard G. Mulvaney, *A Correlational Analysis of the Relation between Catholicity and Birth Rates* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1941).

[25] Bernard G. Mulvaney, "Recent Trends in American Child-bearing," *Am. Cath. Soc. Rev.,* 4:41–46, March, 1943.

[26] Sacred Penitentiary, response of June 16, 1880. For a discussion of the whole question see, Orville N. Griese, *The Morality of Periodic Continence* (Washington: Catholic University, 1942).

[27] The book referred to is, Leo J. Latz, *The Rhythm of Sterility and Fertility in Women* (Chicago: Latz Foundation, 1939).

[28] *Ibid.*, 114.

[29] *Casti connubii.*

[30] *Ibid.*

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 10

[1] 1 John 4:20.

[2] Matt. 5:43.

[3] Matt. 5:46–47.

[4] Luke 10:26.

[5] Luke 10:29.

[6] Luke 10:37.

[7] 4 Kings 17:24.

[8] John 4:9.

[9] Richard Sterner, *The Negro's Share; a Study of Income, Consumption, Housing and Public Assistance* (New York: Harper, 1943). This is one of a series of studies on the Negro in America instituted and financed by the Carnegie Corporation.

[10] 1 John 3:17.

[11] Luke 3:11.

[12] Statement of Rt. Rev. Joseph P. Morrison, Rector of the Cathedral of the Holy Name, Chicago, in an address at the Liturgical Week meeting, Chicago, Oct. 14, 1943.

[13] The story of Juliette Derricotte's life and death is told briefly in, Mary Jenness, *Twelve Negro Americans* (New York: Friendship Press, 1936), pp. 161–180.

[14] John Dollard, *Caste and Class in a Southern Town* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1937), p. 205.

[15] See the analysis of these statistics in, W. D. Weatherford and C. S. Johnson, *Race Relations* (New York: Heath, 1934), pp. 431–432.

[16] Dorothy M. Bowen, *A Study of Sentences Imposed on Whites and Negroes for the Charge of Housebreaking by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia During the Calendar Year 1934* (unpublished study, Catholic University, 1937).

[17] Charles S. Johnson, *Patterns of Negro Segregation* (New York: Harper, 1943) p. 14. This book presents a large mass of similar data.

[18] The work of Johnson just quoted is probably the best treatment of all these customs.

[19] John C. Murphy, *An Analysis of the Attitudes of American Catholics toward the Immigrant and the Negro, 1825–1925* (Washington: Catholic University, 1940), p. 141.

[20] The most important of these pronouncements, perhaps, are contained in, Pope Pius XI, Encyclical, *Mit brennender Sorge,* March 14, 1937. There are important passages also in the following: Pope Leo XIII, Allocution, *C'Incamminiamo,* March 2, 1900, Pope Benedict XV, Encyclical, *Ad beatissimi,* Nov. 1, 1914, Pope Pius XI, Letter, *Cum tertio,* Sept. 17, 1922, Pope Pius XI, Encyclical, *Ad Catholici sacerdotii,* Dec. 20, 1935, Pope Pius XII, *Audistis, Venerabiles Fratres,* Oct. 29, 1939, and Pope Pius XII, *Christmas Broadcast,* Dec. 24, 1942.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 11

[1] Pope Benedict XV, Letter, *Plane videmus te,* Oct. 10, 1915.

[2] Pope Benedict XV, Letter, *Maximas inter horum,* May 22, 1918.

[3] Pope Benedict XV, Letter, *Celeberrima evenisse sollemnia,* Dec. 18, 1919; and Pope Pius XI, Encyclical, *Caritate Christi compulsi,* May 3, 1932.

[4] Pope Pius XI, Encyclical, *Ubi arcano Die,* Dec. 23, 1922; Pope Pius XI, Encyclical, *Quas primas,* Dec. 11, 1925; and Pope Pius XII, Encyclical, *Summi pontificatus,* Oct. 20, 1939.

[5] *Ubi arcano Dei.*

[6] Pope Pius XI, Encyclical, *Rappresentanti in terra,* Dec. 31, 1929.

[7] Pope Pius XI, Allocution, *Benedetto il Natale,* Dec. 24, 1930.

[8] John J. Wright, *National Patriotism in Papal Teaching* (Boston: Stratford, 1942), pp. 27–72.

[9] Most of these statements may be found translated in, Harry C. Koenig (ed.), *Principles for Peace; Selections from Papal Documents, Leo XIII to Pius XII* (Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1943), where they may be traced through the excellent index. For a discussion of many of these passages, see Wright's work just cited.

[10] *Ubi arcano Dei.*

[11] *Caritate Christi compulsi.*

[12] The standard treatment of the subject is, Carlton J. H. Hayes, *The Historical Evolution of Modern Nationalism* (New York: Richard R. Smith, 1931). A good bibliography is, Koppel S. Pinson, *A Bibliographical Introduction to Nationalism* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1935).

[13] Recent research on the period of the French Revolution is brilliantly summarized in the following: Crane Brinton, *A Decade of Revolution, 1789–1799* (New York: Harper, 1934); and Geoffrey Bruun, *Europe and the French Imperium, 1799–1815* (New York: Harper, 1938).

[14] Ps. 2:2.

[15] Rom. 1:16.

[16] H. S. Conrad and R. N. Sanford, "Some Specific War-Attitudes of College Students," *Jour. Psychol.,* 17:153–186, Jan., 1944. On the history of American nationalism see, Paul H. Furfey, *A History of Social Thought* (New York: Macmillan, 1942), pp. 349–352 and the references there cited.

[17] Acts 5:29.

[18] Pope Leo XIII, Encyclical, *Sapientiae christianae,* Jan. 10, 1890.

[19] The statements in this paragraph are based on the examination of a representative and random group of theologians, namely, Henry Davis, *Moral and Pastoral Theology* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1933), 2:121; Thomas Slater, *Manual of Moral Theology* (New York: Benziger, 1909), 1:321; H. Noldin, *Summa theologiae moralis* (Oeniponte: Rauch, 1922), 2:380; Ad. Tanquerey, *Synopsis theologiae moralis et pastoralis* (Tornaci: Desclee, 1909), 3:156; Aloysius Sabetti, *Compendium theologiae moralis* (New York: Pustet, 1920), 287; Arthur Vermeersch, *Theologiae moralis principia* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1928), 2:594; J. P. Gury, *Compendium theologiae moralis* (Rome: Typis Civilitatis Catholicae, 1869), 1:335; A. Ballerini, *Opus theologicum morale,* ed. Pal-

mieri (Prato: Giachetti, 1890), 2:668–669; A. Lehmkuhl, *Theologia moralis* (Fribourg: Herder, 1898), 1:508, 510, 511; St. Alphonsus, *Theologia moralis,* Lib. III, no. 408; C. Marc and F. X. Gestermann, *Institutiones morales Alphonsianae* (Lyons: Vitte, 1927), 1:486–489; and E. Genicot, *Theologiae moralis institutiones* (Louvain: Polleunis et Ceuterick, 1896), 1:378–379.

[20] Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, Section 5(g).

[21] John Eppstein, *The Catholic Tradition of the Law of Nations* (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1935), p. 129.

[22] *Joint Pastoral Letter of the German Hierarchy,* June 26, 1941.

[23] *The Bishops' Statement on Victory and Peace,* Nov. 14, 1942.

[24] Pope Pius XII, Radio Address, *Circondati dal concorso,* May 13, 1942.

[25] Text of the Moscow accord, released for publication, Nov. 1, 1943.

[26] *Washington Post,* Sept. 2, 1943.

[27] Pope Pius XII, *Christmas Broadcast,* Dec. 24, 1942 (original text unavailable). Note also the passage in the address of Pope Pius XII on the fifth anniversary of his coronation, March 12, 1944, in which he referred to "an aerial war which does not recognize any law or restraint, already a terrible indictment against the cruelty of such methods" (text as recorded by the British Ministry of Information and published in the *Washington Post,* March 13, 1944).

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 12

[1] 2 Thess. 3:10.

[2] Rom. 1:28–31.

[3] 2 Cor. 6:14–15.

[4] 2 Cor. 6:17 with a reference to Isa. 52:11 which reads in the Douay Version, "Depart, depart, go ye out from thence."

[5] Rom. 12:2.

[6] Gal. 6:15.

[7] 2 Pet. 1:4.

[8] Rom. 13:14.

[9] 1 Cor. 2:14.

[10] 1 Cor. 1:25.

[11] Pope Pius XI, Encyclical, *Divini Redemptoris,* March 19, 1943.

[12] Pope Pius XI, Encyclical, *Mit brennender Sorge,* March 14, 1937.

[13] Luke 23:5.

[14] Matt. 10:24.

[15] Luke 6:22, 26.

[16] Judges 7:1–25.

[17] Luke 5:2–7.

INDEX

Abortion, 130
Addams, Jane, 107
American Association of Schools of Social Work, 113
American Association of Social Workers, 113
Amos, 89 f., 93 f.
Antichrist, 21
Apocalypse, 21 f., 85

Benedict XV, Pope, 38, 132
Birth rate, 130 f.; Catholic, 134 ff.
Blanchard, P., 129
Bombing of noncombatants, 165 f., 173
Boniface VIII, Pope, 156
Bosco, St. John, 112
Bossard, J. H. S., 14
Bouchard, C., 119
Bowen, D. M., 145
Bromley, D. D., 128
Brookings Institution, 93

Cardijn, Canon, 117 f.
Casablanca Conference, 163
Casti connubii, 76
Catholic conformism, 30 ff. and *passim*
Cavour, Count, 157
Chalmers, Thomas, 105
Charity Organizations Society, 105
Churchill, W., 163, 165
Communism, 25, 166 f.
Comte, A., 69 f.
Conrad, H. S., 158
Conscientious objectors, 161
Contraception, 25, 108, 112, 129 ff.

Davis, K. B., 130
Day, Dorothy, 114
Delplancg, R., 119
Derricotte, J., 144
Divorce, 25, 51, 131
Dollard, J., 145
DuBois, Pierre, 156

Eppstein, J., 161 ff., 165

Fascism, 25
Francis of Assisi, St., 103
Freudian psychiatry, 107

Gillin, J. L., 14

Hamilton, G., 128
Hart, H., 129
Harvey, O. L., 128
Helpers of the Holy Souls, 104
Henry VIII, King, 156
Hitler, A., 25, 154, 157, 162
Husslein, J., 80 f.

Indian, the, 141
Indianapolis Household Survey, 134 f.
Isaias, 90 f., 93 f.

James, St., 85 f., 91 f., 93 ff.
Jew, the, 141, 151
Jocistes, 115 ff., 122
John the Baptist, St., 99, 143
John Cantius, St., 102
John the Evangelist, St., 138, 143
Joseph of Arimathea, 86

Kingdom of God, 21 ff., 54
Kingdom of Satan, 22 ff., 30, 177

Labor, 47 f.
Labor problem, the, 115 ff.
Lauerman, L. L., 111 f.
Law of the three states, 69
Leo XIII, Pope, 28, 38 f., 122, 159 f.
Libby, F. J., 165
Little Sisters of the Poor, 104
Llovera, 81
Louis of France, St., 87, 99 f.
Luke, St., 63 f.
Lundberg, G. A., 71
Lynd, R. S., and H. M., 128

Mangold, G. B., 14
Matthew, St., 66
McCord, C. H., 145
Merry del Val, Cardinal, 39, 81
Mexican, the, 141
Militarism, 25 f.
Modernism, 37 ff.
Mulvaney, B. G., 135
Murphy, J. C., 148
Mussolini, B., 25
Mystery of iniquity, definition of, 23
Mystical Body of Christ, 31, 45, 65 f., 102

National Council for Prevention of War, 165
National Industrial Recovery Act, 121
Nationalism, exaggerated, 27, 66 f., 152 ff., 173
Nazism, 25, 76, 154, 166 f.
Negotiated peace, 163 ff.
Negro, the, 16, 45, 65 f., 79 f., 140 ff., 173, 176
Nell-Breuning, O. van, 81
Neumann, H., 129

Oriental, the, 141, 151

Paul, St., 16, 19, 20 f., 23, 36, 85, 158, 170, 172
Peace Now Movement, 165
Peter, St., 178 f.
Phelps, H. A., 13 f.
Philip the Fair, King, 155 f.
Pius X, Pope, 37 ff., 81
Pius XI, Pope, 25 f., 38, 76, 80, 92 f., 120, 124, 132 f., 136 f., 154 f., 175
Pius XII, Pope, 66 f., 165
Plato, 16
Poverty, voluntary, 99 ff.
Psychiatry, Freudian, 107

Quadragesimo anno, 80

Reuter, E. B., 13
Revolution, French, 156 f.
"Rhythm," the, 135 f.
"Rich," New Testament, meaning of, 86 f.
Richmond, Mary E., 105
Roosevelt, F. D., 163, 165

Sacred Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, 81 f.
St. Vincent de Paul Society, 108
Sanger, M., 130
Sangnier, Marc, 39
Sillon, 39 f.
Sisters of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, 104
Social problems, definition of, 13 ff.
Social work, 66, 102 ff., 176
Sociology, definition of, 68
Sterner, R., 141 f.
Supernaturalism, exaggerated, 43 ff.

Taussig, F. J., 130
Terman, L. M., 127 f.
Thomas Aquinas, St., 88
Totalitarian State, 18, 54

Vincent de Paul, St., 112
Voluntary poverty, 99 ff.

WAC, 132 f.
WAVES, 132 f.
Women, employment of, 131 f.
Works Progress Administration, 142
World, 22 f.

Zacchaeus, 86

Date Due

FACULTY

DEC 3 1 '82

JUN 1 5 1983

JUN 1 5 1986

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01000 3822